

LEVEL
ONE

Christian Order

JUL 28 1981

Summary of Contents for June/July, 1981

PROBLEM CHILDREN	<i>J. C. L. Inman</i>
LITURGICAL REFORM AND LOSS OF FAITH	<i>Rev. Dr. Georg May</i>
SAFE PLATFORM BOYS	<i>Burke Cosgrove</i>
LESSONS FROM AUSTRALIA	<i>Joanna Nash Bogle</i>
GUILTY MEN	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>
RUSSIA'S CHRISTIANS UNDER PERSECUTION	<i>Janice Broun</i>
MUSTARD-SEED MISSIONARY	<i>Czeslaw Jesman</i>

PLEASE NOTE

Christian Order is not published in July and August. This June/July number appears in the first week of June. The August/September number will appear in the first week of September.

Grateful thanks are extended to the very many readers who have renewed their subscriptions so promptly and so generously these past months. This has proved an enormous help. Will the few whose subscriptions are still due be so kind, please, as to send them in without delay? I would be most grateful if they would do so.

Paul Crane, S.J.

Contents

Page

- 322 CHECK *The Editor*
- 324 RUSSIA'S CHRISTIANS
UNDER PERSECUTION
Janice Broun
- 333 BACKGROUND TO
ECUMENISM *Philip Trower*
- 338 SAFE PLATFORM BOYS
Burke Cosgrove
- 341 LITURGICAL REFORM AND
LOSS OF FAITH
Rev. Dr. Georg May
- 350 LESSONS FROM AUSTRALIA
Joanna Nash Bogle
- 354 PROBLEM CHILDREN
J. C. L. Inman
- 360 MUSTARD-SEED
MISSIONARY *Czeslaw Jesman*
- 364 INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE IN
CONTEMPORARY BRITAIN: 2
The Editor
- 374 THE CHRISTIAN MIND AND
AUTHORITY *Henry Edwards*
- 381 BOOK REVIEW *Paul Crane, S.J.*

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £3 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$5.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£6, U.S. \$15
Australia—£7, A. \$15
N. Zealand—£7, N.Z. \$15

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 22

JUNE/JULY

NUMBER 6/7

Check

THE EDITOR

SOME time back, I was startled when a friend drew my attention to a piece in *Le Monde* (15/3/81) which carried the news that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had reaffirmed the long-standing ban—contained within Canon 2335 of the Code of Canon Law—forbidding Catholics to join Masonic or other similar societies.

At the same time, I was irritated. And why? Because a letter written by the same Congregation to *some* Episcopal Conferences on July 19th, 1974 left a great number of Catholics, including myself, under the general impression that the ban placed on Catholics joining Masonic associations had been more or less lifted. Living as we then did in an ecclesiastical climate so rent with confusion that anything at all seemed possible, we were not so shattered by this letter as might have been the case otherwise. So far as we were concerned this was no more than another calamitous expression of the all-pervading permissiveness that was then—and still is, thought to a lesser extent—corroding the Church. It was one more blow between the eyes, but we were so used to blows that we took this one more or less in our stride.

Six and a half years later there came the Declaration from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, dated February 17th, 1981 and published in the English edition of the *Osservatore Romano* for March 9th that, since the

original private letter "has become public and given rise to erroneous and tendentious interpretations", the Congregation reaffirmed the original ban against enrolling in Masonic associations and which had not been modified; as well as the canonical penalties for so doing, which had not been abrogated. What the original letter had sought to do, it added, was to remind certain Episcopal Conferences of the principles to be followed in the solution of particular cases.

Finally and by way of added emphasis, "It was not, however, the intention of the Congregation to permit Episcopal Conferences to issue public pronouncements, by way of a judgment of a general character on the nature of Masonic associations . . ."

Where are we, then? Back at square one after 6½ years of confusion. But with this difference; that, whereas 6½ years ago most Catholics were quite clear on this matter, full credibility with regard to it has now to be restored in view of the "erraneous and tendentious interpretations" placed by certain Hierarchies and their advisers on the original letter of July 19th, 1974. Either this letter was desperately vague and ambiguous and, therefore, incapable of clear and firm interpretations; *or* a permissive and tendentious—some would say michievous—twist was given to its interpretation by some to whom it was sent in the interests, say, of that bogus, "ecumenical" openness, which pervades the Catholic Church at most levels today. In other words—and by parallel with what we have had to suffer in the liturgical field—the game of jumping the gun, then presenting Rome with a *fait accompli* in the hope of its official endorsement by the Vatican as a safeguard against divisiveness. In fact, divisiveness is promoted rather than prevented by such a policy, the effect of which, as pursued during the pontificate of Pope Paul VI, was to enthrone Progressivism as a dominating, domineering, deceitful and disruptive force within the Church. We can be thankful that here, as in other fields, Pope John Paul II is squaring up to this pretentious Progressive Establishment, cutting it down to size and refusing to let it have its way. He has an appalling task ahead of him. He is on the way to its accomplishment. He has called "check", but not yet "mate".

In this moving article, Janice Broun tells of the persecution meted out by the Soviet Government to Russian's Christians during the past decade. An authority on this subject, Janice Broun has drawn on source material for her account.

Russia's Christians under Persecution

JANICE BROUN

1980 saw the fiercest crack-down on Christians in the USSR since Krushchev's closure of about two-thirds of the churches in the early 1960's. The number of arrests in 1980 was double that of 1979, when there was already an increase by reason of the crack-down before the Olympic Games, particularly among Orthodox and Lithuanian Catholics. Arrests among Protestant Evangelical sects, which refuse to admit the State's right to interfere in their internal affairs or to restrict evangelism, have remained steady. These have always had members in prison, for they reject a restricted church life within registered communities under strict state supervision. In January 1980, Adventist Leader, 84-year-old Vladimir Shelkov, died while serving a five-year sentence in a strict regime camp in Yakutia where temperatures drop to -83°F .

Constant Harassment

Some believers have suffered such constant harassment that they can take no more and have renounced Soviet citizenship and applied for emigration. Out of 30,000 applying, only a handful of families have been allowed to leave. Unlike the Jews, 200,000 of whom left in the last decade, they have no active lobby in the West. Seven members of two families of Pentecostals, including the parents of 13 children and three of their grown-up daughters, have been sharing two beds in one small room in the

American Embassy since June 1978, and will stay there indefinitely.* The steadfast witness, courage and irreproachable morality of these Evangelists in a corrupt, vodka-ridden society where half of the marriages end in divorce, have won them many converts. And it is a heartening sign of the growing realisation that Christians must unite against their common enemy, atheism, that Soviet Pentacostalists under persecution have appealed to the Pope.

Bearing the Brunt

Currently, however, it is on the largest Church, the Russian Orthodox, with 30 or 40 million members, that the brunt of persecution has fallen. This is partly because of a revival which has considerably embarrassed the Government. Although most members of this Church are poor, elderly women, they have now been joined by the cream of Russia's intelligentsia and young people, disillusioned by materialism and the emptiness of enforced-Marxist-Leninism. Desperately seeking a meaning to life, some find God, and their real roots, in their own historic Church. In its splendid services, there is an awesome intensity of worship rarely found here in the West. Services in the Russian Orthodox Church are completely unreformed; the liturgy lasts three hours. Congregations stand throughout and don't want to leave at the end. Some converts have felt called to take up the Cross and join Human Rights Movements, knowing that by so doing they face almost certain imprisonment, "psychiatric" hospitalization or exile. A decade ago, a leading lay dissident Anatoli Levitin, now in exile in the West, bemoaned the fact that so few Christians were to be found among the "Good Samaritans". How different the picture is now! Non-Christian dissidents with long and honourable records are continually being drawn to God and seeking baptism. Such is Tatyana Velikanova, much loved mother and grandmother, indefatigable in her warm help for all who came to her in distress.

Reduced to Subservience

The Orthodox Church as such has been reduced to total subservience to the Soviet State. Now that the bishops who

*See *The Siberian Seven* by John Pollock; Hodder & Stoughton; £1.50.

survived the Gulag Archipelago have died off, the State encourages compromised careerists to become bishops. Not a single church appointment is made without the approval of the Council for Religious Affairs, an atheist body whose aim is to regulate, discredit and eventually strangle religion, not to promote it. The laity cannot expect support from their bishops, for those who dare follow their conscience are overruled by local authorities. These reinstated a notoriously dissolute priest, Stryzhik, after he had been excommunicated by Archbishop Bogalep for raping a girl in his baptistry and bringing tragedy on her and her family. Five layfolk in Simferol, including a bedridden woman, were excommunicated for drawing attention to their priest's refusal to administer the Sacraments to those who requested them. "Can we live for three years deprived of the substance of the Body with the Bread?" they pleaded. Bishops allowed to come into contact with western Christians are hand-picked and well paid to deceive them. Under such conditions initiative and protest have to come from church members, often at great risk to themselves. For so doing, one outspoken parishioner, Anastasiya Kleimenova, was interned in a "psychiatric" hospital.

Defence of Believers Rights

Leading dissident priest Fr. Gleb Yakunin was sacked in 1966 and placed outside church control. He and another young priest had written key letters to the Government and Patriarch Alexei exposing the appalling abuses of Krushchev's attack on the church. He and a Jewish physicist, Lev Regelson, also a convert, wrote an impassioned plea which nearly split the World Council of Churches at Nairobi in 1975. The Russian delegates had to be persuaded not to walk out. In fact, Yakunin and Regelson were asking for precisely the kind of support Pope Pius XI gave to persecuted Christians of all denominations in his world-wide day of prayer for Russia in 1930.* Typically, the new Orthodox generation is not only concerned for its own Church. In 1976 Fr. Yakunin founded an Orthodox Committee for the Defence of Believers Rights, which worked primarily on behalf of Christians who had formerly had no

* See *Detente v. Dissent* by Alessio Floridi, S.J. (printed in U.S.A.).

mouthpiece—Orthodox, Evangelical Protestant sects and Catholics, especially those in Moldavia. Lithuanian Catholics and Reform Baptists have for some years been sending regular and reliable bulletins to the West. The Orthodox Committee's work has been to assist and publicize less co-ordinated and articulate groups. Two years later 5 outspoken Lithuanian priests formed a sister Catholic Committee to ease its work load. They sometimes issue joint appeals. Orthodox believers like Yakunin and Regelson compare the firm stance of the Catholic Church with their own vacillating hierarchs; and many of the Orthodox Committee's appeals are addressed to the Pope, particularly since a Polish Pope was elected. A letter to Pope John Paul warned him that there is such close co-operation between the Soviet Government and the Moscow Patriarchate that, in a book on the Catholic Church by Bonchovsky, a visiting priest from Rome found extracts from his own private correspondence with the late Metropolitan Nikodim! The book was hastily withdrawn. Ostpolitik serves only Soviet ends.

The Committee's documents make harrowing reading. We have already quoted some Orthodox examples, and the death of Shelkov. A child, Misha, was put into a "psychiatric" hospital for a time because he tried to run away from the state boarding school where he was forcibly interned, back to his Adventist parents. Young Baptists were taken to a VD clinic to give samples of blood after a prayer meeting was broken up. Lyobov Ovchinnikova was detained with VD patients for 12 days and will carry the record on her passport for life. Having VD is a crime. A well known nun, Valeriya Makeeva, has been interned since 1978 in a "psychiatric" hospital and her arm paralysed by drugs. She had been selling belts embroidered with texts from the 91st psalm to support evicted, destitute nuns. There are many cases of heart-broken Christian mothers. When one partner in a marriage becomes a Christian the other is pressurised to divorce her and always gets custody of the children, however unsuitable he may be. There are numerous cases of believers trying unsuccessfully to get churches re-opened, and often of brutal harassment of "unregistered" services. It is significant that the Committee

has never actually been condemned by the Orthodox Hierarchy.

The Seminar Movement

Another feature of church life, besides the growing co-operation of Christians of different and often antagonistic traditions, has been the growth of the Seminar Movement. The State has sapped congregational life by limiting it to worship. (For instance, Fr. Dmitri Dudko quotes a letter from 4 well qualified ladies, close friends for 40 years working together in a state establishment, who only revealed to each other that they were believers and churchgoers after they retired !) Some young intellectual converts have sought a deeper community life and commitment in seminars where they can share and deepen their religious knowledge and examine how their faith can be related to the outside world. Such "cells" are anathema to the Soviet system which has tried every means of breaking them up—"psychiatric" internment included. Yakunin sees these young Christians as a potential reservoir for what the Church needs most: deeply thinking sacrificial priests and women willing to go to abandoned parishes to restart mission work. With conditions as they are the Church is not allowed to use them, though vast areas of the USSR are now churchless. In these areas, sects, which are much more flexible and evangelically minded than the Orthodox Church itself, risk setting up house churches not under government control, and Yakunin admires them for this. Both Fathers Yakunin and Dudko have appealed to Orthodox Christians of the free world to take churchless and neglected areas of the Soviet Union under their jurisdiction.

Three years ago Fr. Yakunin said it was a miracle none of the Orthodox Christian Committee had been arrested since members of other Committees had been. He thought this might be a reflection of the fact that the Orthodox Committee represents the largest group of citizens in the USSR; "Christianity has a powerful social base; we have tens of millions of believers". Orthodox church attendances at Easter in 1977 were up all over the country by 25% on previous years. "If the influx of people into the Baptists, Pentecostalists and Adventists can be measured in hundreds and thousands, the influx into the Orthodox Church can

be measured in hundreds of thousands! The process may be a mass movement and the authorities fear this".

Pre-Olympic Disaster

The pre-Olympic Games period was disastrous for Christians in the USSR. Leading Orthodox, human rights activists and seminar leaders and two of the Christian Committee, including Fr. Gleb Yakunin, were removed from the scene after arrest. Western public attention, however, was diverted to Iran, then to Arghanistan. Meanwhile, the illegal exile of the most prominent dissident, Andrei Sakharov, took place just before the arrest, in January 1980, of Fr. Dudko, a parish priest not engaged in political activity. Members of the Catholic Committee have been threatened, but whether the Government will dare arrest them is another matter. No parish priest has been imprisoned in Lithuania since 1971. The reason is simple; there would be riots. Arrests of layfolk involved in producing the *Church Chronicle* in that country are a different matter. Fr. Alfonsas Svarinkas has pointed out that almost the entire population of Lithuania are dissidents. The country's Catholic Committee can count on the support of the laity and 522 out of 711 priests. Despite restrictions these have considerably more freedom for pastoral work than those of the Orthodox Church. The same Committee reports a significant movement of young people into the Catholic Church.* The fact that Pope John Paul has created one of Lithuania's two exiled bishops, probably Steponavicius, as Cardinal *in pectore* has given Catholics there great moral support. Lithuanians, and to a lesser extent other Balts, have become bolder in their demands for justice and true self-government for their captive nations. In consequence, far more Lithuanians, many of them highly qualified, mature, responsible, and often Catholics, have been arrested than for years. Similar vicious clamp-downs by the Soviet Authorities have taken place in the Ukraine and Armenia and, in each country, prominent Christians have been arrested. By the end of 1980, all but one of the Council of the Reform Baptists and Pentecost-

*See *Land of Crosses* by Michael Bourdeaux; Augustine Publishing Co., Chulmleigh, Devon. £3.00 plus postage.

alist and Adventist leaders were also in prison. It will be years before these people, the spiritual élite of the Soviet nations, return to circulation, broken in health by the extreme conditions and semi-starvation of the Gulag.

Trials and Sentences

After months of pre-trial investigations, trials of leading Orthodox have been held and sentences duly passed. Steadfast and unflinching as ever, Father Yakunin, father of 3 children, was sentenced to 5 years in a concentration camp and 5 in exile; Tatiana Velikanova to 4 and 5. The seminar leaders Alexander Ogorodnikov and Vladimir Poresh, got 6 and 5 and 5 and 3 years respectively. Both are outstanding young Christians and fathers of tiny children. Tatiana Shchipkova, a convert in middle age and formerly a lecturer in Medieval languages, got 3 years. She has glaucoma and is receiving no treatment. A Leningrad seminar leader, Tatiana Goriceva, is one of dozens of outstanding people forced to leave the USSR during the last decade. A young feminist who sees Our Lady as a pattern of womanhood, she has great maturity of belief and conviction. What will happen to the rank-and-file of seminar members? Not all are of their leaders' calibre. For the time being they have been forced to suspend their activities. The Moscow Committee has been increased to 10 and now contains 2 priests, but new members are trying to remain secret. The flood of documents seems to have been stemmed. However, formerly rather inarticulate Protestant groups are more audacious and have managed to smuggle large quantities of documents to the West, so that side of the Committee's work is being continued.

Body Blow

These arrests and "honourable" sentences were expected. What Christians did not expect was the worst body-blow to the Orthodox Church since the 1960's—the collapse, recantation of their so-called "political" involvement and subsequent release of three men, Victor Khapitanchuk, Secretary of the Christian Committee; Regelson, who had taken over as seminar leader and, incredible as it seems, Fr. Dmitrie Dudko himself. Father Dudko was the best known, most popular priest in Russia, a living icon of what

a priest should be; a great pastor, preacher, evangelist, and a warm, lovable person of peasant origin. It was he who has baptised over 5000 adults (many privately in his bedroom) during his ministry. It was he who held the unique question-and-answer session to help clear from people's minds their appalling ignorance about Christianity. These attracted hordes of young people and seekers-after-truth.* Father Dudko had dared in his sermons to expose the disastrous effects of compulsory atheism on Soviet society and particularly on the family, and to suggest that in Christianity—applied in every day life—lay the only hope for Russia's future. Recently he had dared to duplicate and circulate a parish magazine—an unheard of thing—in which he had exposed the unpunished murders of the well-loved Bishop Methodius in 1974 and Fr. Nikolai Ivas-yuk in 1978. He had described a recent reshuffling of Moscow clergy as “causing fear and dismay among parishioners”. In June he appeared on television, plump and smiling, and renounced his “crimes against the State”. This had a shattering effect on believers and especially on Dudko's hundreds of “spiritual children” and friends. He seemed to be in a state of euphoria—incredible for a man publicly renouncing his life's work.

Father Dudko Begs Forgiveness

After his release, however, Father Dudko lost 40 pounds and was plunged into profound depression. Subsequently he has recovered, and humbly asked forgiveness. “I over-estimated my own strength and fell lower than anyone else has done”. In fact, he had survived an attempt on his life, a car “accident” in 1976, but had carried on his ministry despite his innate fear and nervousness. He had been isolated for half a year. He also has a dearly loved family and two dedicated adolescent children; and we know from other cases that the KGB can stoop to blackmail and murder; yet Dudko blamed only himself for his capitulation. We shall probably never know what exactly happened but we cannot discount the use of drugs. Victor Nekipelov, now in prison, tells of the use of injections of caffeine and medinal in the Serbsky Institute. The subjects developed

**Our Hope* by Dmitrie Dudoko; £5; Stocked by Mowbrays.

euphoria, and an irresistible desire to talk, answer questions and do what their police doctors wanted.* Fr. Vasili Fonchenko and Vadim Shcheglov of the Christian Committee have stated that if they are arrested any statements contrary to their expressed convictions are to be regarded as obtained by illegal methods.

Breaking people morally has been a very rare feature in Soviet trials over the last quarter century. But have we forgotten the show trials of the postwar years, how Cardinal Mindzenty was reduced to an automaton within a few weeks? There are very honourable precedents for Fr. Dmitri! It looks as if the government is using different methods on people whom they regard as slightly vulnerable and whom they want to discredit. This is surely a tribute to Father Dudko's stature and reputation; and an indication of the extent to which Communists dread Christianity when it shows signs of emerging from the ghetto to which they would like to consign it. A Great Power dishonours itself by stooping to use such measures against a solitary individual, just as much as it does when it sends troops into Afghanistan.

The outlook for the minority of bold, confessing Christians in the USSR is very bleak indeed. Those arrested know that in future even more sinister methods of psychological pressure may confront them. Now, more than ever, they need our prayers.

**The Institute of Fools* by Victor Nekipelov.

IF

you are amongst the very few who have received a subscription-reminder during the first months of this year and have not yet replied, would you please be so good as to do so right away. I need this information very badly for my records. Thank you. — *Paul Crane, S.J.*

In this last article in his fine series, Philip Trower writes clearly and positively of the mystery and meaning of true ecumenism.

Background to Ecumenism

5: ITS MEANING AND MYSTERY

PHILIP TROWER

I HAVE been talking about the abuses of ecumenism. But what about the work of the many honest men and women on all sides trying to bring about reunion without sacrificing what they believe to be truth?

The good achieved here is at present very difficult to assess. In the circumstances it is not of a kind that can be expected to have quick large-scale results.

Unquestionably Catholics, or a great many of them, have been shaken out of a number of petty narrow-minded attitudes. On the other side, numerous Protestants of goodwill have been led to consider ideas which before they would probably have rejected without a thought. (Many ordinary Anglicans for instance, not of the high church, are becoming sympathetic to the idea of venerating our Lady, to having priests rather than parsons, to a "real presence" in the Eucharist, to the Holy See — things unheard of before.) With the Eastern Christians certain fears have perhaps been quietened, and, one hopes, hurts as well as ancient misunderstandings removed. All this is a preparation for the future; and any picture we make of the Christian religious future must certainly contain what should be its principal feature; at last—as the possibilities I spoke of just now begin to unfold and are understood—the start of a widespread movement of the separated Christians, corporately and in clusters, towards the Church. This and only this is what Catholic ecumenism exists for.

Necessity of Being of One Mind

Corporate reunion with Eastern Christians in principle offers few difficulties; those that exist have always been mainly psychological and historical. Corporate reunion is hardest to imagine in the case of "liberal" Protestant churches because of their internal disunity about beliefs; to be corporately united with the Catholic Church a separated church or community has to be of one mind. Not to speak of this is, I am certain, a failure in charity. Only if we do speak of it and discuss it will separated Christians of this kind see the importance, beauty and preciousness of being in agreement about what God has revealed and themselves come to long for. That God will inspire them to see the need for this kind of unity is something I believe we should specially pray for.

But are not any possible future advantages offset, and more than offset, by the new misunderstandings that have been created, and the immense loss of faith among Catholics that has resulted from their taking part in the ecumenical movement? Even if multitudes of separated Christians eventually flow into the Church as a result of the movement, other multitudes are flowing out of it. So what are we to make of it all?

Mystery of God's Design

So long as we regard ecumenism as a practical enterprise of the ordinary kind—with clearly foreseeable results provided the right steps are taken—the answer is, I believe, we can make nothing of it. A glimmer of light appears only when we begin to see it as part of a great mystery of God's designs.

Perhaps I can best illustrate what I have in mind and what I believe to be actually happening by means of an image.

Before the Council, it is often said, Catholics lived in a ghetto. But Pope John, in launching the Church into ecumenism, pictured us I think rather differently—as the inhabitants of a beautiful comfortable house selfishly dozing before the fire (or if you like the television set) without bothering about the people outside living in flats, hotels and lodgings not their true home. (The image does not say

everything about the Church before the Council. But it says enough for the present purpose.)

Because, I suggest, Catholics would not go out, or not in sufficient numbers, and with sufficient enthusiasm, to tell the separated Christians and the world as a whole about their marvellous Heaven-provided home, God has allowed it to be broken open so that all the world can trample through and inspect its contents at leisure. Of course the house was never really shut. But God has "thrown it open to the public" and invited in all and sundry in an unprecedented way. The doors are down; the window panes broken; holes have been knocked in the walls. The crowds roam through the rooms at will, looking in cupboards, peering into drawers, examining the furniture, ornaments, books. Though most are well-behaved, a percentage laugh, joke, make ribald comments; the house as they had always suspected is full of "rubbish".

"Dissident Children"

In the house there are also very many of its own children who hate their parents, intensely dislike their home and the way it is run, and are filled with resentments of every kind about their upbringing.

These discontented children have persuaded a proportion of the visitors that the house, and life in it, would be much better if most of the contents were chucked out and more time given to enjoyment and less to serious occupations.

Together they start smashing the ornaments, burning the pictures, breaking up the furniture. The larder and cellars are ransacked. People loll about in chairs, eating and drinking with their boots on the covers. The carpets are awash with wine and beer. The recordplayer is on full blast. Family portraits are used as dartboards; books as footballs and skittles; dirty handmarks and graffiti cover the walls and paintwork.

Other visitors wander about wide-eyed with astonishment; they don't know what to make of it all. Others again are impressed (in spite of the temporary chaos and din); they had no idea the house was so mysterious and wonderful. Secretely some of them are thinking: This is where I should like to live one day.

The remainder of the family are aghast. A minority retreat in a sulk to the attics and lock themselves in; they refuse to believe the Master could have ordered this invasion; some are escaping from a window down a rope of torn up sheets.

The rest, equally bewildered, but anxious to obey the Master's instructions, do the honors of the house as best they can, describe its history, point out its attractions, explain that there is not always such an uproar, and invite their listeners to come and live in it. At the same time in the quieter corners they rapidly try to do some dusting and cleaning which they had neglected before the invasion began.

Eventually, when all the visitors have had the chance to look and listen as much as they wish, a bell will ring, the holes in the walls will be repaired, the broken window panes replaced, the rebellious and bad-mannered will be expelled, the well-behaved who do not want to abide by the rules of the house will be courteously accompanied to the door, while those who ask to remain will be embraced and made welcome. Of those who leave, many, after thinking things over, will perhaps have second thoughts and later, returning to the house, ask to join the family after all.

A Great Summons

The ecumenical movement—which has led to this great public showing of the Church—should, I believe, be seen not so much as a road to a clearly marked goal, but rather as a great summoning together of all the baptized to receive an opportunity and a test; for Catholics a test primarily of their charity and fidelity; for non-Catholics of their goodwill and humility. (Catholic humility has not gone untested either.) But what for? To bring into existence, I imagine, a Catholic people, embracing new and old members, better prepared to give God "His fruit in due season". To produce this people, the baptized are being shaken together and sifted as in a sieve.

It also looks as if all nations, as well as all Christians, are being exposed in some obscure way to the Church.

However, the question which really perplexes Catholics is why God should have chosen to give His house this public showing at what seems to them the worst possible time.

No one can tell why. We only know that this is the way God acts.

As the generations pass, sometimes He lets men see the Church in majesty, at other times in weakness, sometimes externally muddled by corruptions, at others washed clean. The Church is also shown in different states from place to place. A short 20 years ago, she looked in most parts of the world majestic and awe-inspiring; today she is shown ridiculed, reviled, buffeted, torn apart by those who were recently her own children, her own chief priests and men learned in the law. But in whatever way she is shown to the nations, always what is divine in her is partially veiled, though never so much that those who are given the grace and wish to see are not able to. This is the great mystery of ecumenism.

So it was with Jesus.

As for ourselves, all we have to do is patiently carry out the Master's orders. Like the obedient members of the family in the story, we must patiently do the honors of the house; make the visitors welcome, explain clearly and truthfully what is taking place, as best we can repair the damage, so that as many as possible, recognizing at last the Catholic Church for what she truly is, will cry out from their hearts as we do "This is indeed the House of God, the Gate of Heaven", and enter rejoicing into their inheritance.

(Concluded)

Warmly Recommended

BISHOP CHALLONER

by

Monsignor Anthony Stark

Written by the Master of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom in tribute to a great Englishman and most steadfast Catholic Bishop, the second centenary of whose death occurred last January. Published by the Guild from 31, Southdown Road, London SW20 8QJ at 55p (post-free).

Safe Platform Boys

BURKE COSGROVE

IN the "old days" priests never had doubts about the philosophy of their fellow-priests. All believed the same, gave their obedience to the same. In retrospect, this seems amazing and one wonders how it was ever possible. For that matter, how was it ever possible that the great majority of Catholics believed in the same, gave their obedience to the same? And yet it once was so. One is compelled to believe in the Grace of God. Nothing else explains it.

I thought I would write an article from the viewpoint of a modern priest, say one about the age of 40. I found the task too difficult. Then I thought I would write in an ironic vein, but again, it was too difficult. The reader would ask, "*Why is this priest writing? What does he really believe?*" Anyway, I came to this conclusion; I will make a judgment on a certain type of modern priest and I will put that judgment into print. I have no particular priest in mind but I know of several who fit the type. The reader may have his own candidates. I shall call my priest, "Father Brayne".

After ordination Father Brayne was sent to "higher studies", receiving several degrees. He did a short stint of parish work and then some special assignments. He became an author, lecturer and teacher. Most of all, he became known in the media, especially as an interpreter of Church "happenings". He disagreed with the Pope and with several teachings of the Church. He discovered, pleasurably, that this was "news". His image, cultivated, was that of an intellectual trying to force the Church to recognize "modern truth". He was young David against a senile Goliath. The T.V. people loved it. So did he.

Since ordination his ideas of the Church had gradually changed. (He knew he had a first-rate intellect, the Church authorities had recognized this.) For one thing, this first-rate intellect had come to dislike the article, "the" before the word, "Church". "The" was too restrictive, as though

there was only one Church and that, the Catholic Church. Nowadays he preferred the single word, "Church", which somehow was more universal, less sectarian, less repugnant to the common man. What right had any church to call itself, "The Church?" Such a title would be, as it were, constricting the infinite God Who could reveal in many ways to all men. Nevertheless—and this is a very heavy nevertheless—Father Brayne was very conscious of his Roman collar, not in the sense that he wore it very much but in the sense that it was the Catholic priest's symbol, that very good solid platform from which to address the world. By no means did he wish to come off that platform because he knew that once he came off it the media wouldn't give him the time of day, not to mention "prime time". So he did what so many of his predecessors did, he kept the respected title, "Father Brayne, Roman Catholic Priest", while keeping up a relentless attack on several teachings of the Church. He was enjoying the best of both worlds; "All this and Heaven too", as the saying goes.

It seems surprising, but he resented the idea that he was disloyal to the Church. He would reply to such an assertion with a question of his own—"What do *you* mean by 'the Church'?" This, he knew from experience, would lead to a long and subtle discussion of what was the *real* Church, *where* was the real Church, *who* belonged to the real Church; all questions which had the dust of centuries on them. He was extrsmely glib in such a discussion and it would gradually lead away from any question of his loyalty. Not that his armour could not be penetrated. It *could*, whenever the word, "Rome" was mentioned. The word triggered his anger and he would scoff at the idea that truth had been neatly packaged by God and handed to people in Rome for transmission to man. Then there would be a spate of words from Father Brayne—modern man is out of the children's stage and can think for himself; modern man has progressed in so many fields that there is no such thing as "fixed truth"; modern man knows that what is true for him toway may not be true tomorrow; modern man knows that God is much larger than any church. Oh Father Brayne, when he was angry, could wax eloquent, and he was free and so sincere. The media loved it. He loved it.

And yet, despite his freedom from "Rome", he was only another example of a very modern clerical evolution. We all remember the famous rebels of yesteryear. Which one of them was it who said (as he bitterly attacked the Church), "I love my church"? And there are so many other rebels still alive, but alas, now media-less, old hat, passé, without an audience. One cannot help thinking of the Church's recent verdict on Father Hans Kung. Poor Father Kung! He finally went too far and patient, loving Holy Mother the Church had to lower the boom on him; "*You can no longer teach in the name of the Church*". Terrible, terrible words, and don't you believe for a minute that those words didn't hurt. They did. And Father Kung is licking his wounds now by telling the world that he is truly Catholic and therefore deserving of sympathy in his struggle against "Rome". And he *is* getting sympathy from—can you guess?—yes, the media and from the same people who love to watch their own fearless Father Brayne on the tube.

But, as I said, Father Brayne is a type of the most recent clerical evolution. This type is made up of prudent priests, worldly-wise priests. They attack the Church but they never go quite as far as Father Kung. No, these men skulk in the shadows of subjunctive sentences, hypothetical questions, ardent sighings, sophisticated laments; but they do not take the chance of losing that Roman collar! No direct and brave attack on the Church by these men—too dangerous; but, instead, languid tears dropped on the pages of the secular press, tears for their poor, senile, archaic but beloved Church. No, these prudent and worldly-wise priests, as much as they support Father Kung in their hearts (with words just short of treason to the Church in public) really want no part of Father Kung's company because "*You can no longer teach in the name of the Church*". These prudent and worldly-wise priests want no part of that verdict for themselves because if some day they *do* hear that verdict they will know that they are at last men without a country, without a platform and without—worst of all—the time that's called "prime". Truly, for men such as these, a tragedy.

In this his fifth article—one of a series based on a lecture given before the German Branch of the International Federation, *Una Voce*—the Priest-Professor of Canon Law at the University of Mainz, tells the truth of the havoc wrought with the faith of millions of Catholics by post-conciliar liturgical and pastoral reforms. Acknowledgements to *The Remnant*.

Where do We Stand ?

5: LITURGICAL REFORM AND LOSS OF FAITH

REV. DR. GEORG MAY

THE *Una Voce* movement arose as the so-called reformers began to lay their hands on the liturgy of the Church. It first concerned itself with the preservation of the Latin liturgical language and Gregorian Chant. But soon it had to devote itself to the defense of the *content* of the liturgy. For the liturgy of the Church was plundered and deformed to an inconceivable extent; it was protestantized, above all. Concerning the latter, it is not a question of a slogan, as the German bishops think, but of the determination of a fact. For example, it could not be denied that in the *Novus Ordo* of Paul VI the role of the priest in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass is attenuated in a Protestant sense. There is no getting around the idea that the liturgy had to be changed because the Faith was supposed to be changed. He who no longer believes the Catholic faith in fullness, or to whom certain Catholic truths are burdensome, must endeavor to blot them out of his memory. They must then no longer appear in the services of the Church, they must be eliminated from them, or at least distorted beyond recognition. That is just what happened in the so-called reform of the liturgy. The particulars by which to demonstrate this conclusion have been set forth elsewhere. Those truths of the Faith which the so-called reform of the liturgy suppressed, concealed, or obscured are by this time without

expression and without protection; they vanish from the religious life of the people. The faithful no longer get them from some other place; they forget them, rather, and abandon them. Further complaints about the so-called reform of the liturgy have been set forth in other places; they need not be repeated here. In many churches the tabernacle, the place where our Emmanuel dwells, has been displaced by the chair of the priest. In this offensive slight to Our Lord and Saviour the so-called reform of the liturgy has, as it were, pronounced judgement on itself; it manifests a frightening sum of wrong decisions, false measures and aberrations. The Church will not rise again if these things are not stopped.

Pastoral Failure

Prior to the so-called reform of the liturgy they said that the liturgy must be altered, it must be made simpler, more transparent and more understandable, the "language barrier" must fall. Only in this way, they argued, can the people be effectively ministered to by the Church and encouraged to attend Mass. Today there is an unprecedented decline in Mass-attendance to report. In the year 1963, 52% of German Catholics between the ages of 16 and 29 went regularly to church; in the year 1973, on the other hand, only 19%. In the year 1978, 6% of German college students still went to church regularly. Between 1967 and 1978 the number of regular church-goers among them declined about 39% (FAZ No. 139, June 19, 1979). In the June, -1979 bulletin of a parish with a progressive pastor we read: "In B. there are 4604 Catholics. Of these about 760 go more or less regularly to Sunday Mass, a startlingly low number. The situation is similar in other communities. And this despite the fact that the liturgy was renewed and simplified, Mass is said in the vernacular, and music and song are adapted above all to the young people to the greatest possible extent". In Holland the number of Mass attendants sank from 70 to 30% between 1961 and 1970. The pastoral 'success' of the so-called reform of the liturgy exists solely in the imagination of its authors and supporters; the reality is far different. The liberal, and well-disposed-toward-progressivism newspaper *Frankfurter*

Allgemeine Zeitung (No. 139, June 19, 1979), wrote that the so-called reform of the liturgy has "not succeeded in making the eucharistic celebration the center of life in the Christian communities". Not only has this supposed reform brought about no pastoral gain, it is responsible, rather, for startling losses. The Church has lost millions of souls through the so-called reform of the liturgy. The first group consists of those who regard the Mass of Paul VI as invalid and will not take part in it as a matter of principle under any circumstances. We know that their number is not inconsiderable and continually increases. Alongside them are found the faithful whom the New Mass makes uncomfortable because of the continuous flow of words, the incessant irrationalities, and the lack of sacredness. They consider themselves psychologically unable to bear their inherent aversion to these things and attend it no longer. It was probably someone from this group who wrote in the *Neue Bildpost* (No. 31, August 5, 1979, p. 7), that it was the conciliar wave that drove people out of the Church. "If I were not so deeply rooted in the Church, I, too, would turn my back on it". Others stay away from the present day "eucharistic celebrations" because the latter seem foreign to them; they no longer find in them the Mass in which they 'were at home'; they feel themselves robbed of their religious home and react by giving up attendance at Mass. Their number is not small. A further multitude of faithful have actually lost their faith because of the so-called reform of the liturgy. The incessant revolutionary changes in the most sacred Thing in the Church, the manner in which the post-conciliar Church deals with the eucharistic sacrament of sacrifice, the unheard-of excesses in preaching, and the entire condition of the permissive Church, have shaken their conviction of the truth and of the reality of that which takes place in the Mass. I reckon that we find in this group the greatest part of the Catholic college students. I am convinced that the loud (and frequently hasty or little emphasized) delivery of the so-called Great Prayer [Canon] together with the so-called Account of the Last Supper have destroyed the Faith of many. Just silence or interior prayer are, after all, suitable to the inexpressible mystery. A last group no longer feels in the post-conciliar meal-celebration the numinosity, the ador-

ation of the divine Mystery. Rather, these persons have the impression of being in a classroom situation, of being amused, of 'togetherness'. But for these things they do not go to church, but to the tavern. So, likewise, they come to give up participation in the Mass. Also, many religious people are repelled by the new Mass. They miss the religious seriousness. A pious Catholic woman said to me the other day that "Something inside me resists calling the present service a Mass; it certainly isn't that any more".

Many true Catholics have told me that they were often tempted by the thought to give up going to weekday Mass; for before one has properly prepared himself to pray, the Mass is already finished. There are persons of authority in our Church who cunningly and relentlessly refuse any fair-minded liturgical concession. They expect that resistance to the innovations will certainly flag and that, in any case, the faithful will get used to them. To these people let it be said that the souls you have lost and driven out of the Church by the so-called reform of the liturgy you will never get back; you will have to answer for them one day before the Eternal Judge. May God be merciful to you at this reckoning.

Destruction of Reverence

Apart from the textual changes, numerous other innovations of the so-called reform of the liturgy are a pastoral washout. The so-called reform of the liturgy has above all damaged most seriously, reverence, the indispensable presupposition of every Mass. It has curtailed or done away with the very symbols of reverence. Here is an example. In the General Introduction to the Roman Missal it is provided that the participants of the Mass stand for the most part, and sit for another not inconsiderable part. Kneeling is prescribed merely during the Consecration (the German translation renders this word as "Account of the Last Supper"!), and this also with three restrictions, namely if the narrowness of the space or the larger number of participants or other reasonable grounds do not hinder it (no. 21). When the signs of reverence fall, the thing itself usually collapses. This is precisely what we observe with the so-called reform of the liturgy. Even a supporter of the innovations had to grant that the "reserve supply of rev-

erence", which stemmed from the pre-conciliar time, had been used up following the so-called reforms (J. Stiren). The damage which has been inflicted on faith in the Eucharist by the introduction of communion-in-the-hand won't be made good again in generations. Here and there the idea has been expressed to do something about it. The Bishops' Conference of the Philippines has had the courage to drop communion-in-the-hand. The German bishops are a long way from taking a similar step. Their liaison with the progressivist professors is too close; if they were to presume to do it they would draw their wrath upon themselves. Let it therefore be said to them here once more: The unfalsified Catholic faith protests against the manner and mode with which the post-conciliar Church deals with the Eucharistic sacrament of sacrifice. One can so proceed, with the Last Supper, perhaps, if one is a Zwinglian, but not if one wants to remain Catholic and believes in the Real Presence.

Truth, Not the Majority

Many attempts are made to establish the supposed justification of the innovations by referring to the 'large number' of persons who are in favor of them, or in any case accept them. I confess that these numbers make little impression on me. For we know how present-day majorities are produced. We know the effectiveness of propaganda. But we also know what the fear of men and the anxiety of isolating oneself have the power to do. We have experienced the power of mass psychosis. We know the power of attraction behind influence, esteem and money. We have experienced how very much man is inclined to time-serving. On the other hand, the fact that relatively few people suffer under the so-called reforms is easily comprehensible; for the mass of mankind is concerned less with the truth than it is concerned with anything. Nothing is so inconvenient for them as the truth; nothing is so readily acceptable to them as the elimination of difficulties; they accept nothing more joyfully than the cheapening and increasing of comforts. What interests the average man is the pleasant, easy life; but commitment and struggle for the truth, exertion, and sacrifice run directly contrary to this. They tell us that we stand alone, and that our view is outmoded. Yet, since

when has the truth of an opinion about anything whatever been measured by the number of those who share it? Since when is the sum of indifference toward the truth, pragmatic thought, and opportunism a surety for the knowledge of what is right? Since when does incompetence become competence when it comes forward *en masse*? Since when does folly result in true wisdom? Many a man has stood alone before the tribunal of history in the past, but the Spirit of Truth was with him. Correct principles do not lose their validity because they are not allowed to be carried through. In the Old Testament the prophet Elias advanced alone toward 450 priests of Baal. As Schiller says, "Not the majority vote is the test of what's right".

There are even people who like the new liturgy, who extol its alleged superiority and who are convinced of its value. I confess that this phenomenon also makes little impression on me. Most people just resign themselves to that which, to all appearances, cannot be changed, and try to get to like its good aspects. The memory of the earlier liturgy fades away; so they lack more and more a standard of comparison. The innovators have declared to them for so long that the post-conciliar liturgy is better than the old, that they finally accept it and hold it to be true. The incessant activity in the new liturgy works hand-in-hand with the impulse in men to activity and the aversion from independent prayer. The seeming popularity of the new liturgy rests, therefore, partially on the same ground as television. The silence of the Canon is plainly uncomfortable to many of our contemporaries, who need continuous background noise. Latin has vanished; in its place the vernacular has appeared; it gives rise to the opinion of many listeners that now they are going to be able to *understand* everything. Moreover, the new liturgy has certainly brought with it many agreeable and comfortable features which are gratefully received. One sits or stands, one kneels hardly at all any more. One no longer needs a book to read, because everything is spoken aloud. The Mass is considerably shorter. The texts with unpleasant, upsetting truths and demands have been mostly eliminated. Slide shows, music and dance interludes offer welcome variety. In short; one can understand that people who do not think

and who have forgotten the full reality of the living God find things to please them in the new liturgy.

The Vernacular

By the use of the vernacular in the liturgy they have created the illusion in people that now they "understand everything". Allow me the following remarks on that: It was once always possible for the faithful, who were untrained in the Latin language and who had at hand a good prayerbook, to follow the vernacular text of the Mass and the sacraments. Before the great collapse, there existed not a few diocesan hymnals in which were printed not only the ordinary, but also the proper parts of the Mass for every Sunday and for every major feast. Since everyone in Germany can read, it would have been possible for anyone to follow the course of the Mass completely. On the other hand, it is questionable whether the provision (and if possible delivery aloud) of the whole text of the Mass in the vernacular has helped the understanding of that which takes place at the altar. The theological concepts are, after all, of a depth which makes them accessible only to the searching, praying, and loving soul; their mere presentation is quite useless. Without the individual's own activity they are inaccessible and will not be fruitful for him. On this basis, word-for-word communication and the speaking-aloud of the texts without exception are not as critical for full cooperation in the sacrifice of the Mass as *interior* understanding of the action and an *inner* joining with this action. To put it another way: He who knows what Christ does in the Mass and joins himself to Him in disposition, he and only he participates in the Mass. Everything external can only facilitate this inner union, or, on the other hand, make it more difficult. An excess of exterior busyness, an incessant, indeed, an all too often breathless talking, does not serve the inner union with Jesus offering himself in sacrifice, but in fact hinders it. We know that the prophecy of Abbot Gueranger has come to fulfillment in an uncomfortable way; according to which, after the introduction of the vernacular in the liturgy, "the people will soon find out that it is not worth while to lay down their work or their pleasures to listen to just such talk as they hear in a public place".

Further Campaign of the "Reformers"

It is clear to us that the so-called reformers have still not reached their final goal. Owing to retarding forces they have still to make certain concessions to the Catholic Faith they have taken possession of. Provisionally they still tolerate the mention in the liturgy that Jesus is not merely the Nazarene, but God made man. Provisionally they still accept on occasion the mention of the Triune God, though as seldom and as unclearly as possible. But they do not give up; they press on, and above all they establish a wild praxis which already comes very close to their ideas. How the "liturgy" of the future is supposed to look makes itself known by many examples. In the diocese of Limburg a song is recommended as church music in which it says, ingeniously: "I am tired, I am going to bed; but before I go I want to ask something: why are the big people allowed to drive us away from almost everything? Manometer, manometer, I think that's dumb".

Collopse of Order in the Church

The so-called reform of the liturgy is for the most part the fruit of disobedience. Innumerable facets of this "reform" were introduced into the Mass without permission and spread by propaganda. Would something be practised which is arbitrary and in contradiction to the valid law of clergy and laity, then the shepherds of the Church accepted it and prescribed it for the obedient faithful. Similar occurrences were to be observed in other areas of ecclesiastical life. In the performing of mixed marriages and in relations with non-Catholics, for example, practices were introduced — again in disobedience — which were later accepted by Pope and bishops and made binding. These proceedings are a matter of record. It is known of the National Socialists (Nazis) that in 1933 they began new breaches of the law against their opponents again and again and created accomplished facts; the on-going wrongs were then turned into law by legislation of the government of the Reich. One can make a list of similar occurrences in the last fifteen years in our Church. Moreover, they are in progress today. In the liturgy, in ecumenical activity, and in the priestly life important laws remain widely unobserved. Communion

is offered to non-Catholics, divorced persons are remarried in the Church, clerical garb is not worn. Frequently this happens under the eyes of and with the full knowledge of the bishops, who are, however, obliged by Church law to watch over the observance of the law in their respective dioceses. The innovators say to themselves: "If only we persevere in our unlawful practices with sufficient obstinacy, and find a sufficient following, then the shepherds of the Church will again do our will this time and turn our unauthorized actions into ecclesiastical norms". It has come to the point that obedience is still demanded only of those whose readiness to obey is known, while from the others, of whom one knows that they will *not* obey, obedience is not required.

Loss of Security in the Law

The Catholic Church of the post-conciliar period is in an advanced state of dissolution in disciplinary matters. Security and protection in the law of the Church have reached a low point. He who has only the law on his side is in bad shape in the Church of today. For the law is weak because it counts for nothing and is disregarded. The professional guardians of the law fail to a dramatic degree. In general they no longer take on those who dissolve the law. Reference to an occasional admonition does not alter this conclusion in the slightest. One cannot, on the one hand, desire to hold to a binding doctrine and order in the Church, and, on the other hand, let those do as they please who continually undermine both. A Church whose members no longer pay attention to the law and do not live in strict discipline is condemned to decline. It is inconceivable how the shepherds of the Church can forget the truth that we carry our treasure in earthen vessels; to put it another way: that the great favors which Christ entrusted to His disciples can be preserved only in a well-disciplined, strict life. Now on this earth the highest values are also the most exposed to danger, and in order to protect them despite all dangers, it is necessary to have order and discipline, laws and their strict observance.

(To be continued)

Joanna Nash Bogle writes perceptively and with vigour of a group of women in Australia who really want to be women. Their sanity should be shared by others.

Lessons from Australia

JOANNA NASH BOGLE

IT really is about time that some common sense was talked about the question of "sex equality" and the role of women. For too long, we have allowed a dreary alliance of women's liberationists and government bureaucrats to dictate our national policies on this subject. We must assert the importance of fresh and independent thinking.

Some very sensible thinking has been done in Australia, where a group of women have formed an organisation with the express purpose of combating some of the current non-sense promoted by the proponents of "sexual equality". Their aim is to enhance the status of uniquely female roles and to "affirm that men and women are *equal but different*, not equal and the same". The leader of the group is Mrs. Babette Francis of Melbourne, Victoria. In 1975, as a gesture for International Women's Year, the Premier of Victoria, Mr. Hamer, appointed a Committee to inquire into the status of women. As a result, a further Committee was appointed to examine the question of equal opportunity in schools. Following strong representations made to the Premier and to the Minister of Education, Mrs. Francis was invited to join this Committee as a representative of mothers and homemakers. This was something of a breakthrough, because homemakers had been completely ignored throughout International Women's Year in Australia.

Mrs. Francis complained at an early stage that there was no recognition of the enormously important work that women do in caring for their families and raising children. Instead, the Committee was asked to assess the effect on school students of "an absence of female role models in positions of seniority and high status"—the clear inference being that the role of wife and mother in itself is not

deserving of high status. Eventually, Mrs. Francis produced her own Minority Report, which makes fascinating reading. After spending over a year working with the Committee, discussing and analysing evidence, she found that members were simply unwilling to look at some of the facts presented to them. For instance, it was pointed out that girls learn to read earlier than boys and that fewer girls than boys experience reading difficulties. Yet the Committee still insisted on stating that the problem with reading material lay in the fact that books tended to show men and women as "sexual stereotypes", eg women as mothers with small babies, and men as having more outdoor and exciting activities. Mrs. Francis commented later: "Despite the fact that boys' performances in reading, writing, and English are inferior to that of girls, and that boys always outnumber girls in slow-learner groups or in classes for the physically, emotionally and psychologically handicapped, the ingenious feminist theory is that it is girls who are disadvantaged because males are mentioned more often and in more active roles!"

To give some examples of the sort of thing Mrs. Francis had to fight against; in 1975 as a contribution to International Women's Year a special double-issue of *Education News* (produced by the Australian Government's Department of Education) was published. It was entitled "Sexism in Education". One picture was captioned "Sacred Motherhood" and showed a miserable mother in 19th century garments trying to breast-feed a baby whilst operating a treadle sewing machine, surrounded by miserable-looking children. Mrs. Francis commented: "Now I'll admit that I have sometimes answered the 'phone while feeding a baby, but does anyone today really have to operate a treadle sewing machine while breast-feeding? The dishonesty of this picture is breathtaking — if it aims to depict what life was like for women at that time, it should also show what it was like for men, many of whom were having their heads or legs blown off in wars for which only males were conscripted". Another picture in the same newspaper showed a poster which had been produced by the Women's Movement Children's Literature Co-Operative Ltd. It depicted a beaming father in modern clothes chang-

ing a baby and bottle-feeding it. Mrs. Francis commented crisply : "One wonders what happened to his treadle sewing machine".

Here in Britain we have had more than our fair share of nonsense about "sex equality" and "role reversal". I myself, as Chairman of a school governing body, was sent a copy of an expensive booklet (forty pages, fully illustrated, and with a coloured stiff cover) produced by the Equal Opportunities Commission and purporting to discuss equal educational opportunities. It stated that children should never be asked to divide into groups along "sexist" lines—eg boys to clear away furniture, girls to do some other task. It urged that pictures or wall-friezes depicting "parenting activities" should show men as well as women feeding babies. One teacher commented to me : "Children are not fools, they know perfectly well how Mummy feeds babies, and they know that Daddy is physically incapable of doing it the same way. Are we trying to tell them lies about biology and human anatomy?"

In Britain, the Equal Opportunities Commission runs a newspaper which appears every two months and is sent free to anyone who asks for it. The Commission has a huge staff running several regional offices, a library, and a publicity service. It gives away substantial grants every year to groups such as the National Council for Civil Liberties to pay for particular research projects. At a time when the Government is committed to reducing public expenditure, could we not legitimately ask that the EOC be dispensed with? I am writing as a woman who believes firmly that men and women should share opportunities for developing their talents. I am a journalist, and have been earning my own living since the day after I left school (in fact I was earning money by my writing while I was still at school!). I've travelled abroad on lecture tours, taken part in debates at universities, won two local elections, appeared on radio and television a large number of times and intend to continue with many of these activities for as long as I am able to do so (and women generally live longer than men!) But I do believe that there are fundamental differences between men and women. I do believe that women are entitled to be full-time mothers and homemakers and that the family

is the fundamental unit of society. I am convinced that the vast majority of women in Britain share my views on this. We need to recognise the contribution made by the Christian ethic in raising the status of women. We need to promote the good news about what Christian marriage means. We need to call for co-operation, not confrontation, between the sexes. In modern society, it is very often men who are disadvantaged. Infant mortality is higher among boys, the incidence of alcoholism is higher among men than among women, the prison population includes more men, and there are far more male homeless derelicts than women.

Mrs. Francis has described the emergence of a new "GOOF" theory: "GOOF" stands for "Great Oppression Of Females". Certainly, there are plenty of people offering fatuous GOOF material at the present time. Silliest of all was the American bishop who agreed to remove "offensive" words such as "brother" and "men" from the liturgy in his diocese and to substitute neutral "non-sexist" nouns. But the worrying thing is that this nonsense has become institutionalised. 1980 saw a "Mid Decade Conference for Women" sponsored by the United Nations in Copenhagen. It was stated that the U.N. had declared a "Decade for Women" beginning with International Women's Year in 1975. The Mid-Decade Conference was dominated by international wrangles over such matters as Palestine and Israeli/Arab arguments. Its value to women must have been non-existent. But some interesting things emerged. An international "forum", which anybody could attend, was held at the same time as the official Conference, and among the women who flocked there was one from Russia, a prominent Russian feminist who had been expelled from her own country as a "dissident". Russian feminists are a very different brand from the Western variety: they have far more in common with people like Mrs. Babette Francis and the present author. Mrs. Natalya Malachovskaya said that she had little time for the Women's Libbers of the West and went on: "I think that our kind of feminism is very different from that in the West. In our country a man is not allowed to be a man nor a woman a woman. This leads to frequent divorces, because only between real men and women is love possible".

Comments on a paper entitled "The Context of Liturgical Formation" by the Revd. Anthony B. Boylan, JCD, National Adviser for liturgical formation, Liturgy Commission, Bishops' Conference of England and Wales.

Problem Children

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

J. C. L. INMAN

"We've Got a Problem"

IN his introduction, Fr. Boylan ascknowledges that, far from our liturgical "renewal" being a success, we've "got a problem". He writes of "The deficiencies of the years behind us", and suggests a remedial programme which "Will hardly be one which is ideal academically, since it will be designed to meet the emergency situation which has developed". In his expert view, this programme should be "Ruthlessly practical and strongly pastoral in orientation, aimed at all involved in worship, but especially those who lead it, understanding it more fully . . .". The theme of understanding and knowledge runs right through the paper. The possibility of there being even the tiniest flaw in the New Mass, the product of academics rather than those with pastoral experience, is nowhere entertained; it is clearly unthinkable. The fault lies in the inadequate formation of clergy and laity alike; the only fault attributable to the academics being an inadequate initial appreciation of the difficulties in instructing people in a "Manner of worship which makes new and much greater demands upon those who lead it". I always thought that the whole pastoral idea behind a revised Order of Mass was that it should be simpler and more comprehensible, not that it should be more difficult, more demanding. Still, academics tend to make things difficult when given a free hand. And I always love it, when things do not work out, finding them proposing hypothetical solutions which are "hardly ideal academically"!

Mirage in the Desert

As ever in our crisis-laden, so-called "renewed" Church, I am left to wonder if our experts really know any better than most clergy and many of the laity what is practical, what is pastoral and indeed what is true worship. The experts have been dominant for nearly two decades. Their products have been imposed on the entire western-rite Church without a vestige of prior, careful, humble and sensitive consumer-testing. After 12 years of ruthlessness, of unprecedented explanation and instruction, of disunity, abuses and confusion, of hurt and losses, what is now proposed? Further ruthlessness of a self-proclaimed, practical nature. A now diminished and on average older body of parochial clergy must finally be better instructed, must be made to know how to train those of the faithful who still turn up, so that the glorious success so confidently predicted at the time of the introduction of the New Mass is finally achieved. I think a thirsty Fr. Boylan is in the desert, as far as commonsense and true pastoral feeling are concerned, confidently following a mirage.

"Back Liturgical Formation" -

The paper's first section is entitled "Basic Liturgical Formation". Here I read that we should acquire a foundation or framework of knowledge which "Should also provide a sensitivity to the Christian tradition of worship in its broadest sense, so that worshippers, and especially ministers, can feel themselves to be sharing in a tradition, and even contributing towards it". I was all agog; sensitivity to tradition in its broadest sense! Was His Reverence now going to suggest that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* be implemented in its fullness, or were there some twists in the interpretation of the word "tradition" ahead? Indeed there were. Apparently, "Much of the controversy which has surrounded the reform of the Order of Mass in the Roman Liturgy has arisen because people are almost totally ignorant of the truly traditional structure of our worship". We must understand "what is essential and traditional", and what is "peripheral and transient". Such is a liturgical archaeologist's understanding of the true meaning of the word tradition. Apparently only the early Church, emerg-

ing and evolving, had "traditions". Those that obtained, those which—oh so slowly, oh so carefully—emerged from, say, about 600 A.D. until after the Council—a period covering more than two-thirds of the Church's history—and which gave stability, unity and beauty to countless millions, are regarded as mere padding; as accretions, superfluous, peripheral and transient, not as traditions at all! This padding just had to be stripped away overnight for our own good, even if we didn't find the Council saying so, for our contemporary liturgical academics had made a discovery. An identikit-like creature called "Modern Man" obviously needed and would respond to a return to early times, for he was a primitive at heart. Even if he didn't entirely realise this, he would do so once he had been "properly" formed, once he "understood", once the wretched brute had been trained to jump through paper-covered hoops at the word of command. Well, I'm one of substantial numbers who just do not believe these particular trainers, whose "practical" methods do not work, because based on theories rather than patent facts. I hope I have some kinship with all Christians of all ages, but to suggest that it is only my kinship with early Christians that is essential to my "progress" and "renewal" is plain daft; academic theory gone crazy and nothing more. Have I no kinship with Saxons, Normans, Mediaeval Britons, the Recusants, Victorians, or my parents and their friends? I have indeed, and they didn't suffer under "ruthlessly practical", precipitate liturgical innovators whose own product has itself created the very emergency from which they are trying to extricate themselves (and us) at the moment.

"Practical Formation"

After getting our basic formation drummed into us, we are to proceed to "Practical Formation". In effect, Fr. Boylan is not proposing anything new here, nor anything which is solidly proven in practice. It is a continuation of his success-through-understanding theory. Somehow this is supposed to persuade us to "Put the whole of ourselves into worship: body, mind and spirit". But it is immediately made clear which part of our being he is really wanting; "The deeper we appreciate intellectually the reasons why

we do what we do, the more all-embracing our participation will be". Our emotions are not mentioned, presumably because they are known by experts to be most unreliable aids. Once we understand why our bodies must be endlessly bobbing up and down like yo-yos, why we must clatter around shaking hands or kissing, once we understand the merits of mouthing responses in pidgin English, once we concentrate on and understand every word that is boomed out at us by the President through his microphone, then we will love it, we will be participating well enough to satisfy any martinet. Participation to Father Boylan clearly means being seen and heard: one's presence, interior personal prayerfulness is not participation, except for those fleeting moments when we are ordered to press the personal prayer button, switching it off course instantly at the word of command.

Accent on Intellectual Conviction

I suppose it is very understandable that academics find it difficult at heart to grasp that only a small number of worshipers are thirsting after knowledge, that most are neither capable of nor want their faith to be made largely a matter of intellectual conviction. The argument may be that they ought to be made into rational, logical believers, as far as they are able but this kind of emphasis seems to many to be at the expense of reverence, awe of and spontaneous love of God. The section in Father Boylan's paper called "Increasing the power of the Word in those who worship" tells us that the revised lectionary has not yet achieved its full impact, almost certainly because its structure and its pastoral objectives have not yet been fully understood". (My emphasis). In the days before the Council, when the Church was presenting our religion so inadequately according to to-day's experts, we had two readings on an annual cycle which slowly became familiar, at least to some. Today, with three readings on a three-year cycle, the prospects for gaining familiarity are dim indeed. After about 10 years of the New Mass, a survey was done in a large South London parish, where people were asked on leaving Mass what were the readings. 90% plus could not recollect one, let alone all three of the

readings they had heard only half an hour before! Ask a lay reader what was the Gospel read by the priest. He will know his own piece extremely well but, as to the Gospel, one gets replies like, "Well, it sounds stupid, it'll come back in a minute, but, do you know, I just cannot remember". There's a world of difference between didactic theories and expectations, and what is achieved in practice. Fr. Boylan will have to devise a means of getting people out to mid-week liturgical and scripture evening classes if he's going to have time to train their brains. I just wonder how many will turn up in our humanistic "renewed" days?

Symbols and Such

Another subject for which time must be found to train us is in "Increasing the value and authenticity of the symbols for those who worship". Fr. Boylan states absolutely correctly that "Before the reform of our liturgy, there was little or no verbal communication in it. Whatever was communicated (does Fr. Boylan imply very little?) was communicated by the visual rather than the verbal". Exactly. Through familiarity, through precise rubrics, through every Mass celebrated by every priest in every Church in every western-rite country being the same, we had a chance over the years to become familiar with symbols, to appreciate their reverence to God. Today, we've got to be taught what Fr. X's symbols mean, and why they are different from Fr. Y's. All must obviously aspire to at least a C.S.E. in symbolism and those who are able, to an "O" level or higher. I can see homilies going on for three-quarters of an hour, while all this instruction is going on. I wonder what the effect on Mass attendance will be?

Erudite Stuff

We must also understand about "The development of authentic ceremonial" and appreciate the "Development of the environment of worship". It's all very erudite stuff: once we even reflect a bit of this erudition, obviously the liturgy will work as anticipated, won't it? Well, I'd like to finish these comments by describing a paradox. The

Latin Mass Society was founded in 1965, and at that time our "knowing" Progressives were certain that it would fizzle out as it's preponderantly aged membership of nostalgics were taken to their reward. What is the position 15 years later? Certainly there have been lots of obituaries, but the membership is slowly growing, and an "Under 30's" section has been formed. And where do many of these young members, whose memories of the Immemorial Mass are dim or non-existent, happen to come from? From the Universities! From the intellectual cream, from those who ought to be able and to want to "understand" the "perfection" of our emergency-making New Mass which, in conjunction with "renewed" catechesis, was looked on by the Progressive Establishment as the ideal instrument for reviving this country's Faith.

Does Father Boylan Really Know?

Progressive circles will no doubt deem me stupid, ignorant and lacking in the humility appropriate to my station as a low-down; because daring, even, to think about or question the suitability of Fr. Boylan in his role as adviser in liturgical matters to our Hierarchy. After all, Fr. Boylan is neither dim nor technically ignorant of his subject, even if in his writings he appears totally lacking in humility. Certainly, he knows his liturgical archaeology and history, as indeed, he should. But I wonder if he really knows his stuff about the psychology of those who worship, which I believe is very varied indeed? I wonder if he has the remotest clue as to what is really practical in the sense of it being proven to work in widespread, real, everyday situations? I wonder if he has any deep sensitivity or sympathy beneath his advocacy of ruthlessness? From what I've read of his writings, from what I can sense of his attitude to the priests and people actually involved at the sharp end, it seems to me that he has no more competence to advise the Hierarchy on the subject of the psychology of worship and its pastorally effective practice than I have the competence to advise the editor of *Women's Own* on the finer details of petit point.

A classic example of the parable of the mustard seed is found in the story of Father Wladislaw Bukowski, who died in December, 1974 in Karaganda, Soviet Central Asia.

Mustard-Seed Missionary

CZESLAW JESMAN

THE Holy See has always sought to convert Russia. Since the Council of Florence in 1439, the Catholic Church has never abandoned the hope of healing the breach between East and West. Consecutive Popes have sought to expunge the feral dates that stand out like sores in the history of the two Churches—867, when Photius “deposed” Pope Nicholas I and 1204, when Boniface of Montferrat and his Crusaders took Constantinople by storm. (In so doing, incidentally, they were prompted and wire-pulled by Dandolo, Doge of Venice, who wanted to grab for his own benefit what remained, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, of the Eastern Roman Empire). Since that date, the ecclesiastical abyss between Greeks and Latins has remained unfathomable. Russia became heir to this tradition when it took over the Eastern Empire at the end of the seventeenth century. For the Czars in St. Petersburg, the Catholic Church remained one of the principal enemies of the ever-expanding Russian Empire. The enmity was directed, in particular, against all forms of the Uniate variation of the Catholic Church. Against this brief background, it can be said that the policy of Stalin was no more than the continuation of an ancient relentless and virulent hostility.

At the end of World War II, it looked very much as if Stalin's aims with regard to the Catholic Church had been achieved. Officially, there was, at that time, only one priest engaged in pastoral work in the whole of the USSR. This was the parish incumbent of the only church in Moscow

allowed to remain open, primarily for members of the diplomatic corps residing in the Soviet capital. The incumbent was an American Catholic priest. At the same time, several hundred other Catholic priests were in concentration camps. Nevertheless—and despite this seemingly appalling situation where the Catholic Faith was concerned—that Faith was in ferment in the furthest corner of the Soviet Union. To understand how and why, one has to go back to the year 1936 when the Polish Government, despairing of finding effective help from or, at least, of being taken seriously by the West, tried to pacify Hitler's Third Reich with a sort of *detente*. As a result of this, over thirty thousand Soviet citizens of Polish extraction, who had remained settled for centuries in the Western Ukraine, which shared frontiers with Poland, were transported by a nervous Soviet Government to Kazakhstan in Central Asia. The majority of those transported were believing Catholics of the Latin Rite. A few Catholic priests went with them, more or less unknown as such to the authorities and in disguise. In general, however, those transported were deprived of the Sacraments in the same way that the Volga Germans in the Soviet Union (descendants of colonists settled on the banks of that river by the Czars) were so deprived.

The next wave of Catholic believers poured into the remotest nooks and crannies of Stalin's Soviet Empire from 1940 onwards. The mass deportation of some 1.5 million Poles, which the Soviet Government carried out in that year after its invasion of Eastern Poland by pre-arrangement with Hitler's Germany, was accompanied and followed by the transportation to the East of the Soviet Union of Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Byelorussians and Ukrainian Greek Catholics from the so-called Eastern Marches of pre-war Poland. No statistics of these non-Polish deportations were ever kept or, if kept, revealed. Not so long after the deportations about 200,000 Poles, together with a sprinkling of Jews, Byelorussians, and Ukrainians left the Soviet Union in 1942 to serve under General Anders. (The concession enabling them to go was forced out of Stalin, who found himself flat on his back in the Summer of 1941 as a result of the German invasion of

his country, which brought Hitler's armies to the gates of Moscow). The remainder of the deportees and their descendants are still living in the virtually unmapped, vast emptiness taken up by that part of the USSR, which lies between the Arctic Circle and the torrid, sandy desserts of Central Asia. One of these deportees, a Polish priest, Father Wladislaw Bukowski, born in the Ukraine and educated and ordained in Poland, who had been imprisoned by the Communist Regime for nearly ten years in a series of prisons and concentration camps, asked for and was given Soviet citizenship in 1954 in order that he might continue amongst them the pastoral work which he managed to carry out as a prisoner. Father Bukowski was imprisoned in Karaganda in the same year that he sought Soviet citizenship. He carried on his pastoral and missionary activities in prison and concentration camp until 1958, when he was released. He continued the same work as a "free" priest in Karaganda until the end of 1961, when he went on one month's leave—his first ever—to Poland. Early in 1962, he was back—remarkably enough—at his post in Karaganda. He died there in March, 1974; and there he is buried.

Whilst in Poland, Father Bukowski wrote his memoirs in hurried fashion and left them with his hosts, with the proviso that they should be published only after his death. His wish has now been fulfilled and the memoirs have appeared in Polish in a slight volume of seventy-nine pages. The booklet is a mine of unexpected information on pastoral work in the Soviet Union in the conditions under which Father Bukowski laboured; and of the problems of everyday life and work which any priest engaged in this apostolate must face; also, it speaks of the great crop of souls which can be gathered in there.

Father Bukowski found Soviet rules and regulations invariably hostile to his work. As always, however, life's human and unpredictable element smoothed what would otherwise have been a rough if not impassable path. Theoretically, *all* missionary activity of *any* sort was and is forbidden within the Soviet Union. It follows that Father Bukowski, who made no secret of the fact that he was a Catholic priest, ought to have been imprisoned from the

moment he opted for Soviet citizenship until his death. In actual fact, he clocked, as he put it, 13 years, 5 months and 10 days of imprisonment, the record of 17 years being held by his friend Mgr. Josef Kucyzynski.

His life as a social and political outcast in the Soviet Union failed in any to depress Father Bukowski; and his sense of humour never deserted him.

His charity was of evangelical proportions. He was very clear-sighted and unsentimental. There is no mention of real "baddies" in his Memoirs, yet, at the hands of some of the camp guards, he had to suffer from what he calls "unavoidable unpleasantness", such as being beaten up for appearing at night in one of the camp passageways on his way back to his sleeping barracks from hearing the General Confession of a lapsed young Catholic. Indeed, there is in Father Bukowski's story infinitely less—if any—bitterness than in Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag*. At the same time, this Polish priest's remarks on the Russians and citizens of others of Russia's immediate neighbours, in Soviet camps and prisons or out of them, are remarkably perceptive. This saintly and heroic missionary has left behind him an amazingly coherent and charitable blueprint for the future. The light that is from himself in his pages shines out as a beacon in apparently unrelievable darkness.

The mystery of the priestly vocation belongs to the supernatural. There is no rational explanation as to why a man should choose to be ordained. Indeed and, of course, there have been periods in the Church's history when men became priests for unashamedly mundane reasons. One remembers King Louis XVI of France remarking of the then successful candidate for the archiepiscopal see of Paris that, at least, he believed in God. Ten years later the candidate and the king had their heads cut off in public. The mystery of the good priesthood remains; its circumstances are, as a rule, for less dramatic. Some glimpses of what it is all about appear in the Memoirs of the heroic missionary of Kazakhstan :

"I don't know what the future will bring to me and my friends working in the Soviet Union. We do not know how God's providence will watch over our Church in this country. What I do know is that the yoke of Christ is sweet and its burden light".

Following on last month's article, which outlined the moral principles which have to be taken account of in any objective analysis of industrial disputes, Father Crane in this second article endeavours to answer a collection of particular questions put to him from time to time during past years. He claims no more than personal responsibility for his answers.

CURRENT COMMENT

Industrial Dispute in Contemporary Britain

2: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE EDITOR

THE Right to Work: To what extent has a union official or shop steward the right to instruct union members to "down tools?" Granted that each individual in a free society has the right to withdraw his own labour, does this extend to the right to tell the neighbour also to withdraw?

Let me ask you to keep in mind the general principles outlined in a previous article. In their light, it should be clear that no union official or shop steward has the right to instruct union members to down tools except in a morally good or just cause. In other words, to be moral and, therefore, justified, that withdrawal of labour, which downing tools represents, must conform to the five conditions which govern the justice of any withdrawal of labour. If it does not do so, no official or shop steward has any right to call on union members to down tools, for neither he nor any man has any right to order another to do that which is unjust and, therefore, morally wrong.

At this point, I have no hesitation in saying that most withdrawals of labour to which men are summoned today

in this country are immoral and, therefore, unjustified because they break one or other of the five conditions which must be fulfilled if a withdrawal of labour is to be justified. Let me give some examples.

In the case, for example, of hospital workers, condition two is frequently broken: this says that there must be a proportion between the good sought by the strikers (for example, a wage-increase) and the suffering brought in the train of a strike (in this case, that inflicted on helpless patients). In the words, eight years ago, of a coroner inquiring into the death of a patient, who died three hours after a delayed admittance to York City Hospital because of a strike: "Those people who seek employment connected with the preservation of life take upon themselves a responsibility which fetters the normal right of workers to withdraw their labour". (*Daily Telegraph* 23/3/73.) This is absolutely correct and the reasoning used applies to other areas of employment. In general, those who engage in employment which, of its nature, carries heavier responsibilities to the community, must have graver reasons for striking than those engaged in other occupations. Indeed, in some cases, there can be no reasons sufficiently grave to allow strike action, because the havoc certain to be caused is such as to outweigh for certain any good that may come to the strikers from the strike. Into this category come the police and armed forces, doctors and nurses, very probably hospital workers and, in my own personal opinion, teachers, because the scandal these give through their action—the bad example set their pupils—is such as to outweigh any benefits a strike might bring them.

All this, of course, is apart from the fact that, nowadays, most strikers have been too impatient to attempt a solution through negotiations, so that very few strikes I, at least, know of could be classed as means of last resort. Far too frequently they add up to a soured reaction of first resort and must be classed, in consequence, as unjust. Additionally, some of them have been used, either from the outset or after they have been in process for some time, as a means of embarrassing governments politically and, indeed, bringing them down. To use a strike in this fashion—as a political weapon—gives us further cause to brand it

as morally wrong and, therefore, as completely unjustified. The reason for this is that a political strike represents an attempt to effect political change through a brand of disruption that is foreign to the normal democratic process; in other words, the abandonment of an ordered means of change without cause for that which is disordered, anarchic and foreign to man's nature as a reasoning, human being; thereby, once again, the political, or politically motivated strike is seen straightway as a means that is not of last resort: in consequence, it must be classed straightway as unjust and condemned as such.

Let me round off this necessarily long-winded answer to your first question by pointing out, in reply to the second of the sub-questions which it contains, that an individual unionist, if asked to withdraw his labour in support of a just strike, is, in the normal course of events, morally bound to do so: failure here would place him in support of injustice.

Blacklegs and Scabs: If, in defiance of the majority, a minority wish to continue to work, should they be ostracised and their work "blackened"?

If I may so, the assumption underlying this question would appear to be incorrect. It is, so far as I can see, that majority rule is moral rule. This is by no means so. Moral right and wrong are not made by votes; voters are bound to take count of moral right and wrong when they vote. What is relevant here is not whether the majority have voted for a strike, but whether the strike itself is morally justified. If it is not morally justified, then no action against those who refuse to strike is justified and the same applies to the products of the firm which employs them (blacking). If taken, these kinds of action merely compound the original injustice.

If the strike, on the other hand, is morally justified, then, even in these circumstances, strikers must remember that they cannot use violence and intimidation against the unjust minority which continues at work and is, therefore, a partner to injustice. Except in very exceptional circumstances, too complicated to be discussed here, their action cannot go beyond peaceful protest and picketing, and the

encouragement of sympathetic strike action, as explained in a previous article; also, the encouragement of others to black and boycott goods which are produced under conditions of injustice which, we suppose here, are sufficiently evil to merit this kind of additional action.

Picketing: Is not the doctrine of "peaceful picketing" inconsistent with the right of the individual to carry out any lawful activity in support of the livelihood of himself and his family? Are not hospital pickets, for example, who prevent medical supplies from going into hospitals guilty of "not loving thy neighbour as thyself"; or, in modern terminology, guilty of crimes against humanity?

Let me remind you that a just strike is essentially a withdrawal of labour in support of a cause that is morally justified because in conformity with the five conditions that make it so and that have been enumerated and explained in a previous article.

In support of a just strike, strikers may station pickets at factory gates as part of a campaign to draw the attention of the public in general and their fellow-workers, in particular, to the justice of their cause and to dissuade the latter *peacefully* from continuing at work and becoming, thereby, a party to injustice. What they may not do — even under the presumption that their strike is just — is engage in direct and violent action against those who continue unjustly at work or against innocent third parties. (And let me remind you that under violent action in this context are included the use of obscene and threatening language against those who continue at work, to say nothing of their families, spitting at them and so on.) Both courses of action are forbidden as morally wrong by the nature of a strike as a *defensive withdrawal* of labour and the nature of man, as reasonable and responsible and forbidden, in consequence, to have the kind of easy recourse to violent action that strike pickets now indulge in. Anything beyond the point of advertisement and discussion is matter not for the individual picket in a just strike, but for appropriate public authority. The alternative is anarchy of the type we have come close to at times in this country during past years.

In answer, then, to your first sub-question under this count—where a strike is just, non-striking workers are partners to injustice and, therefore, peaceful picketing, as just explained, may be used against them. Where, however, the strike is unjust (and, as already stated, I know few strikes these past years in this country which can be described as morally justified), picketing of any kind is unjust, for, even when peaceful, it is used in support of injustice. Where, as is usually the case nowadays, this point is exceeded and violence is used against non-striking workers, injustice is merely compounded. Where pickets have gone further still and directly attacked innocent third parties—as was the case with the miners in 1972 when they sent mobile pickets to black supplies to the power stations—injustice is compounded still further. The same applies to the action of pickets in hospital workers strikes during past months and years when they blocked the entry, in some cases, of supplies of medicine, food, fuel and so on to the hospitals. Their action in so doing was outrageously immoral and deserved to be punished with the full severity of the law. Those guilty of this type of action or its advocacy are little far removed in outlook from the mugger. It seems to me that they should be punished as such.

Sit-ins and Interference with Work in Progress: Do these not conflict with the doctrine of private property and the need to have respect for our neighbour's goods? And, where the sit-in is deliberately planned to prevent volunteers doing the work is not the evil even greater?

To answer this question appropriately I don't think you need to introduce, in the very first place, the doctrine of private property, the question of trespass and so on. Let us stick to the simple point—a strike is a withdrawal of labour. A sit-in can be defined for our first purposes here as a defensive withdrawal of labour at a place of work. If this withdrawal is morally justified; that is, if it satisfies the five conditions needed to justify any withdrawal of labour, then there is no reason why it should not take place; why labour should not be withdrawn, with the workers remaining at their place of work, as distinct from

leaving it and staying at home. There is, of course, an extra consideration that has to be taken into account in this kind of sit-in, even when morally justified. The distinction to be given may seem over-subtle, but it needs careful consideration. A strike is a *defensive* withdrawal of labour and so is a sit-in. If the latter adds up to a positive and direct attack on the property comprised by a place of work, as distinct from its passive and harmless occupation, then, clearly, the action becomes morally unjustifiable. Similarly, if the sit-in, even though just, passes the bounds set by peaceful picketing and adds up to a positive and direct attack even on unjust co-operators, as distinct from passive resistance offered them, it will become morally unjustifiable. The distinction here (as you may have noticed) is both delicate and complicated. What has to be remembered is that, in this case, direct action, even in support of justice, must be a matter not of first, but of last resort and within a framework of established law; otherwise, the gate is open to violence and anarchy.

This much, where that withdrawal of labour at work, which we call a sit-in, is justified. Where it is not justified, then every action in support of it is unjustified. Therefore, the need for further clarification in this case in terms of property rights and passive, as distinct from positive and direct action, does not arise. Any action in support of the original act of injustice serves merely to compound it.

I have been dealing with the sit-in considered as a form of defensive labour-withdrawal. But there is another side to it; it has another form. I refer to its use as an offensive instrument, a means of bringing pressure to bear on authority through public disruption in support of a particular point of view.

In general, this is morally wrong, though, of course, the extent of the wrong will vary with the circumstances of any particular case. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, it represents very often a direct attack on innocent third parties as in the case, for example, when members of Women's Lib. some years ago sat themselves down on the floor of the all-night post office in Trafalgar Square and had to be forcibly removed by police; or again,

where people sit down in the street, disrupting traffic and passers by, to draw attention to a grievance that may be theirs. So one might go on. This kind of direct offensive against innocent third parties is morally wrong. People are no more entitled to engage in it than I am to heave a brick through a neighbourhood shop-window in protest against the rate-policy of the local council. The reason I cannot do this is that the end does not justify the means; that is, I cannot do wrong that good may come of it; and the policy of directly disrupting the lives of innocent third parties (to draw their attention to a particular injustice of which *they* are not guilty) is morally wrong because contrary to the dignity of man's nature as human. This demands, at the very least, that men and women deal with each other in a human way; on a basis, that is, of reasoned argument and discussion; not inhumanly, as animals would, disrupting the lives of others, who have done no harm against them, in order to get their own way; making snatch and grab, not mannered courtesy and consideration, their normal method of procedure. Those who act in this fashion do no more than reduce public life to the level of the barnyard. Now this, in essence, is what a sit-in of the type just described is and does and this is why it is forbidden by the moral law, which governs man's nature as a moral (i.e. human) being.

Neither, in the second place, can a sit-in of the type described be defended as a protest and, therefore, justified on the ground that protest is a right men have, especially in a democracy. The answer here is that protest, indeed, is justified, but not in any form: it must be suited to man's nature as a human being guided under God by reason and a sense of responsibility. This, as we have seen, is precisely what a sit-in aimed at disrupting the lives of innocent third parties is not.

Finally—and by way of rounding off this answer—we have to consider a type of sit-in, which is not a defensive withdrawal of labour and which is not aimed at innocent third parties, but at the source itself of a particular injustice by those who are its victims or others, who do not suffer from it, but are determined to oppose it in this fashion. Here one has to ask whether or not the particular

injustice justifies a sit-in and, in particular, whether or not the sit-in is, in this case, a means of last resort; whether or not, that is, all other means of peaceful discussion and argumentation, which befit the nature of human beings and accord with their dignity, have been tried in an effort to remove the particular injustice. Moreover, it appears to me that a sit-in of this sort must always be excluded on the ground that peaceful picketing is *always* equally effective, so that a sit-in never can be a means of last resort. Finally, a sit-in of this type is unjustified because it by-passes normal, democratic processes, slow and, indeed, defective though these may be in this particular case; if these are disregarded, the gate to anarchy is opened. The blow against human dignity which this represents is sufficiently adverse, to my way of thinking, to outweigh any immediate benefit the sit-in may secure for its protagonists.

Power of Trade Unions: Should trade unions be allowed to develop into a kind of legalised protection racket? Should membership be compulsory and should those who do not wish to join be intimidated or sent to coventry?

The second of your two sub-questions under this head has, in fact, been covered in a previous article dealing with general principles. There, the whole question of the closed shop, with which this sub-question is intimately connected, was, I hope, effectively dealt with.

So far as concerns the first sub-question, the answer must be, No. No grouping of capitalists or workers can be allowed to use its strength in such a way as to earn its living at the expense of the community and not in its service. That is what *monopoly* capitalism (not the capitalist system) always does, using its strength to eliminate competition, thereby dominating the market, then proceeding to its chosen policy of selling a little for a lot (higher price), rather than a lot for a little (lower price). This way the community is plundered, held up by a monopolist as a bandit holds up a train; its members placed in a perpetual conditions of having too little of the things they want at too high a price. The most effective way of dealing with this abuse is not nationalization (which

assumes so naively that government monopoly will not do what private monopoly does), but the enforcement by government of fair competition on the industrial community: into the details of this process I cannot enter here, for I have at my disposal neither the time nor the space.

In the same way today, trade unions have become bandits, extorting from the community under threat of strike action what they think their members should have, not in relation to their output, but according to what their leaders think can be got for them, irrespective of the value of what they produce. Thus, in order that trade-union demands of this sort may be satisfied, the community is submitted to the hardship of almost continuous strike action, then looted because forced to buy goods of steadily decreasing quality at increasingly high prices, brought about by a wage-inflation, which is itself the result of inflated wages forced out of employers by constant strikes. Those who suffer most as a result of this process are, of course, those on fixed incomes, particularly the old and the helpless. It is at their expense particularly, not in the service of anyone, that trade unionists today so often make their pile. Like the monopoly capitalists, they, too, are bandits, holding the rest of the community to ransom and living off the proceeds.

Not all the present trade-union talk of the British tradition of collective bargaining can obscure the fact that, because of present trade-union power and trade-union ruthlessness, collective bargaining in Britain until a few months ago had become no more than an instrument of extortion; so that any agreement reached through this process added up to little more than the equivalent of a shotgun marriage. Monopolistic extortion is as reprehensible morally in the hands of the workers as it is in those of the capitalists. The remedy for it is, once again, too many-sided to allow me to discuss it here with any degree of detail. We could reach a point, however, at which all strikes in aid of higher wages would have to be forbidden *permanently* by law and easily accessible, independent pay tribunals *permanently* established as a feature of this country's industrial life. Whether we do so or not will depend largely on the trade unions themselves: if they use their

power responsibly, there will be no need for this sort of arrangement. If they do not, then, in all likelihood, it will have to be set up for good and all; which would be a great pity and which no one wants. It is up to the trade unions to decide, for only they can decide whether their immense industrial power will be responsibly used or not.

Wage Claims: Is it possible to establish basic principles and guide lines for reasonable claims to cover greater productivity and increases in the cost of living? Is it right for Unions to pay lip service to the poorly paid, but use any improvement in their lot to boost high wage rates on the basis of the principle of maintaining differentials?

Your first sub-question is, I think, too involved to allow answering in the space at my disposal. Briefly, the answer to it is, Yes; with the proviso that further complications arise almost as soon as appropriate guide lines appear to have been finalised. These are soon seen as out of date. This is always the case, when one tries to apply static criteria to a dynamic economy.

As to the second question, there can be no doubt, I think, but that differentials have been used by the more highly paid workers in this country as a means to distributive injustice; meaning by this, as a way of ensuring that the proceeds of the productive process in a factory or plant shall be distributed disproportionately in their favour. The same applies, of course, to the constant demand for percentage increases in wages which we have had in this country since the war. This means weighting in favour of the higher-paid workers and, therefore, the promotion of distributive injustice. It can be said, in fact, that a good many of the wage increases of the post-war years have been as much at the expense of the lower-paid workers as at that of the rest of the community. There can be no doubt, but that this type of action, of which we have seen so much, is morally wrong.

As always, Henry Edwards' approach to the subject of authority appears as unusual, yet thoroughly orthodox for all that. It is this particular blend which makes his writing so attractive. What follows is no exception.

The Christian Mind and Authority

HENRY EDWARDS

WHEN Robert Browning was still alive, there sprang up Browning societies which studied his poetry chiefly in order to understand it. One evening Browning went into such a society and, as he was unknown in his appearance to the members, was able to suggest the correct meaning of a difficult passage without his suggestion being received as necessarily correct. The members one by one told him that his suggestion was clearly wrong. He did not upset them by announcing his identity.

Authority and Tyranny

Obviously he spoke with authority; but this is to remind us that authority derives from authorship. Somehow other words which have come from the same source (Latin: *augere*, to produce, and sometimes, to make things increase) have come to have a derogatory meaning and have dragged the word authority with them. I notice that the word "authoritarian" does not appear in several old dictionaries I have; but, "authoritative" is held to mean not only "having authority" but "distatorial". In our day, especially within the liberal democracies, anything "dictatorial" is felt to be evil. And a "dictator" is regarded *per se* as a "tyrant". Originally, "tyrant" meant hardly more than an absolute monarch. It did not at all follow that such a monarch used his power oppressively—the word derives from the Doric for the Greek *kyrios*, a lord or master. Perhaps were we living in some ideal world, it would not

be at all bad to have the legal power invested in one who would, like David, have the law hidden in his heart. "By reason of sin", as our medieval ancestors would have said, there is peril in any government which claims absoluteness. Indeed, a Christian may well think that no human government dare claim absoluteness by right. The so-called "people's governments" are as tyrannical as the rule of old bad tyrants. More subtly, liberal democracies can act tyrannically. Because so many of us assume that they reflect some overweening public opinion, they can claim to rule for all the world as if rebellion against them could rank as really wicked. This is a fallacy. We have a supposedly model Constitution (Disraeli pleaded that other realms should not use it as a "model farm"). But when the fate of the valley of Cwm Tryweryn was considered at Westminster, there were more M.P.'s for London's and its dormitory constituencies than in the whole of the nation wherein Tryweryn's people lived. Significantly, not one M.P. for a Welsh constituency voted for the drowning of that valley. Perhaps never before was there such a combination of Welshmen of different political parties united over the saving of that valley. Again, towards the end of the Second World War, I heard a powerful speech by a Dominican at Haverstock Hill Priory against the very idea of "unconditional surrender", which was the determined demand of the democratic States opposing Hitler as well as the tyrannous Government of the Soviet Union. The friar rightly declared that only God had the right to demand unconditional surrender. But, at that time, large numbers of decent respectable people assented to the slogan, and I knew then as a soldier that it would be highly dangerous to my freedom were I to speak my mind on the matter, for all that I have always had a prejudice against Germans and others of their race (the English are not really as close to the Germans as the nineteenth-century germanophiles would have had the English believe).

Authority in the Thirties; and Now

We have in recent years largely come to thinking that there is something wrong with authority itself; and I have met people who call themselves Christians who think of God as a constitutional monarch, to use the conventional expression. He is, they seem to be saying, going on realising

more and more of Himself. I dare say there is a version of that among so-called progressive Catholics. But just when did we begin to abhor rather than to dislike what we call "authoritarian" governments — those which clearly show themselves to be authoritarian? I am fairly sure that the widespread abhorrence was not felt in the thirties, when a curious air of powerful political conviction replaced the cynicism of the twenties. Despite the post-war denial by most Germans that only a very few of them were Nazis, it is fairly accurate to say that, in 1941, the Nazi Government in Germany was popular. In the same way Italians were mainly Fascists then. The Thirties was the decade in these Isles of the Left and Right Book Clubs—a polarisation of intense conviction. It was, I believe, a decade of intolerance. In its place today there is violence without conviction — without real authority. And the dogmatic pacifism of that decade has been replaced by a utilitarian pacifism.

It is necessary for the theologian to use such an anthropomorphism as "father" when we think of the First Person of the Holy Trinity. Alas, the analogy has less puissance today. The poor old father of today seems to his children rather a bore and something of a comic figure. It is not then strange that nowadays in Holy Church some *periti* appear to be trying to separate concepts of love and caring from those of power and authority. Maritain, whom I try not to quote, did once write of "order within the flaming heart of love". It seems an easy step to question the concept of law, which is, after all, a faculty of the undeviating reason at its source. Law is pitted against the ratiocinative reason and denounced as authority is denounced. No wonder there is a rise in practical anarchism; e.g., "Trealaw skins rule Rhys Street". Yet, there seems to be something rather arbitrary about a certain rejection of authority. When I was 14 I was given a set of log tables and I was told to use them as utterly authoritative. I was never told how they came to be made. Schoolchildren are given them today and they do not hesitate to use them. They are provided with other formulae which they equally accept. It is not enough to say that they "work". The schoolchild has not been shown that they will work when he is given them. He assumes they will work. I have never been able to understand how minus 2 multiplied by minus 3 equals plus 6;

and when I have asked many ordinary people nearly all admit that they do not know how it comes to be so, even if they are ready to admit the authority of this formula. If, by the way, a reader reads the pertinent chapter in Spengler's erudite *Decline of the West*, he will see that Spengler makes quite a case for the view that the whole mathematical edifice is subjective and has meaning only for Western Man. No doubt he is wrong. But those who insist that in science and physics and maths we must accept authority should know that people like Einstein have put forth objections.

Freedom and Authority

It does not surprise me to find those who are quite ready to accept authority in the sciences, shrinking, at the same time, from accepting, say, Catholic dogmatics. At least, they cannot accept dogmatics *per se*. This may be partly due to the circumstance (in England and the English-speaking world) that the "og" sound often goes with words of derogatory meaning or capable of such meaning; like dog, fog, hog, soggy, togs, wog and cog (as in someone being compared to a cog in the wheel). It was suggested by a Jesuit on a radio feature on Freemasonry in the U.K. that most of its inhabitants are really unconscious Deists. If this be so, then that is another reason for a rejection of Christian authority. Another reason for a suspicion of authority is the curious flight from what I may call a sense of history. "History is bunk", said Ford. And many accept that dictum. I am uncertain why. It may be due to their part discovery that much that passes as history is the stuff of barristers' briefs. Two world wars showed us what "propaganda" could do. It may be true that few people ever read the leading article of a fairly good newspaper. Again, the two wars gave millions a basinful of "authority". When a man got demobbed, he no doubt felt a curious sense of freedom which he connoted with having no longer to obey the sergeant (or the sergeant the officer). A false antithesis was set up; freedom and authority. In the section of the English army, in which I worked for some time, to disobey certain authority was to court instant death. My freedom depended very much on authority.

Rejection Through Innuendo

Journalists nowadays have a specious trick of rejecting authority. When a Pope speaks, they generally emphasise the Pope's name with the innuendo that what, say, John Paul II says would not have been said by Paul VI. Taking into account the lesser authority of bishops, we ought not to accept the notion implied by many journalists, that what a bishop utters upon faith and morals happens to be his own private opinion, especially in, say, a pastoral letter. The rule admits of exceptions; but the rule must be observed. (About twenty-five years ago I had to review for *The Western Mail* a book by Bishop (later Cardinal) Heenan, a book concerning the Faith for Catholic children leaving school. To my consternation I found he had written: "Calvin was excommunicated for teaching the doctrine of predestination". I wrote to Bishop Heenan, who with great courtesy told me that I had a duty to expose his error. He added that, were the book to have a second edition, he would amend the error by writing: "Calvin was excommunicated for teaching a false doctrine concerning predestination"). We must beware of the trick which suggests that, if some young Catholics are able to wait long enough a Pope will arrive who will give vastly different judgements on contraception, sodomy or some other deviation from sound objective ethics. We must not suppose, as I read in a Catholic periodical, that "the debate may go on".

The Church and Freedom of Thought

An old and common objection to the Faith is that when, let us suppose, a man is given the grace to become a Catholic, he at once loses his freedom of thought. Chesterton answered that by pointing out that a man cured of St. Vitus Dance does not demonstrate his good health by remaining like a statue. One has but to study the several schools of theology upon the Mass as Sacrifice (long known before we got pastoralmania and "the Spirit of Vatican II" to grasp that real freedom of thought is easily found in the Church. But, we hear it commonly said, the Church is suffering from a grave crisis and the frequent implication is that she would surmount it, were she to give way to the

modern mind, which, of course, is not a universal one or even a mind, but a mood.

The Technique of Inversion

In another context, Sir Arnold Lunn wrote of the "technique of inversion". Here is an example. The Church is not suffering from a grave crisis, at least not such a crisis as she has experienced in other epochs. The "world" is clearly suffering from a number of grave crises. Somehow the slick journalist has contrived to shift our attention away from these worldly crises to ills which, without doubt, affect the Latin part of the Church Militant. Offhand I cannot see, as the slick journalist sees, that such ills are the result of that old bogey, the monolithic centralised papacy. I might be pardoned for supposing that they are largely due to diocesan synodic conferences which leave me with the strong impression that a bishop is not supreme in his diocese but, rather, subordinate to a local synod. Pascal observed that when bad reasons are given for something, people will not accept good reasons for it when the bad reasons are discovered for what they are. He had in mind the vacuum which he discovered. Now it must be admitted that, during the last 150 years of English and Welsh history, there were far too many parish priests (who seem to have had an Irish background) who exceeded their powers. One of them called on me when I was going to review a book by a Methodist called *Why I Am a Protestant*. The priest looked at the title and said: "Oh, that is easy. You just have to say that it is all wrong". His tone was quite dictatorial. A pity, because the author began by denouncing several errors of early Protestants. Alas, the "spirit of Vatican II" seems to have reduced the parish priests to what, in fact, some priests have dared call themselves, presidents of congregations. Are these signs of a grave crisis of authority? Not so. I mean that there are remedies at close hand for all grades and conditions in the Church. Moreover, I believe that the slanting eccentrics who have done so much damage are not nearly so powerful as the media helped to make them. That is not to say that the malaise has gone. Yet the Church is like a treacle barrel. You can put your fist so far down but no further.

Ultramontane Progressives

One may need a sense of humour (almost unknown among Progressives) to spot the irony of those Catholics who have found themselves easy in mind in openly opposing papal teaching as demonstrated in *Humanae Vitae* and *Mysterium Fidei*, but who have sometimes talked like ultramontanes when they have found themselves in agreement with some *obiter dictum* of Paul VI, or, most of all, when they invoke the "spirit of Vatican II", as if the "spirit" had been ratified by a Pope. Ultramontanism was never called a heresy: it is a disease. I believe that it arrived after the Middle Ages when States tended to produce absolute monarchs. Several examples of popes being rebuked by lesser mortals could be cited from earlier days. My favourite example is the rebuke by St. Bernard to Pope Honorius II because that Pope had set aside the interdicts of all the French bishops against Louis VI, who had unjustly oppressed the Archbishop of Paris. It has not been suggested that St. Bernard erred. It is said sometimes that we cannot act like him because we are not saints. The obvious answer to that is that no one is a saint till he is dead.

Lastly, I believe that a strong objection against "authority" (though one little heard but rather implicit) is that authority is not only opposed to charity but is arbitrary and barren. Chesterton easily disposed of the objection that it was arbitrary in his *Conversion and the Catholic Church*. But barren? If it be really true that the authority of Pope and bishop and priest derives from our Lord's authority, then Our Lord is the Good Shepherd and has command over his helpers. He has a fold which means limits; but "they shall go in and out and find pasture", aided by those helpers. The authority of Holy Church is not deprived of that other meaning of "augere", to "increase" or "produce". At least the saints have known that.

Book Review

GUILTY MEN

Pope Paul's New Mass by Michael Davies; Angelus Press, Dickinson, Texas, 77539, U.S.A.; pp. 673; available from Augustine Publishing Company, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL at £5.75 (post-free): for the Irish Republic at IR£8.65 (post-free).

Some years ago, when the defences of this country were being reduced steadily to a deplorable state, I was responsible for the remark that there was justification for the assumption, as a not unreasonable hypothesis, that the reduction in question was not haphazard, but deliberately sought. I am *not* saying that it was deliberately sought and, therefore, conspiratorial; simply that it was a not unreasonable hypothesis to file away in the back of one's mind that this might be the case. For, had anyone set out deliberately to destroy Britain's defences, he could not have done it better than those responsible for their destruction at the time, whatever their motive might have been. Andrew Boyle's excellent study, *The Climate of Treason*, certainly lends support to this view. Kim Philby was not the only victim of what came to be known as the "Cambridge penetration" (by the K.G.B.) in the thirties. How many victims that penetration claimed we do not know. Certainly, more than Philby.

The same thought came to me when making my way through Michael Davies' third, final and very fair volume of his three under the general heading of "The Liturgical Revolution". The volume in question is entitled, *Pope Paul's New Mass*. In it the story of the progressive destruction of the Old Mass and the enthronement of the New is there told in full. The story is devastating. Reading it, I was compelled once again to say to myself as, indeed, I had said before with regard to the liturgical revolution: "I lay no wild accusations with regard to liturgical plotting; but, had any group set out deliberately to destroy the Faith, they could not have done it better than through the destruction of the Mass, which is central to the Faith. If

worship is an expression of belief, the way to shatter belief is so to shatter worship that it no longer expresses belief at all or in anything like adequate fashion". This precisely is what has been done. I am in no way denying the validity of the New Mass; no more is Michael Davies. I am saying simply that it is inadequate in its expression of Catholic Belief—as Davies shows most clearly—and that, as offered in not a few individual cases—there is reason for doubting its validity; the reason being that the New Mass is so constructed that it *can* be celebrated very easily without the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. Indeed, the retired Anglican Bishop of Southwark, Mervyn Stockwood, has expressed himself as most happy with the new Roman Catholic Liturgy of the Mass—to the point where he makes use of it himself with a very good conscience indeed. Apart from this question of validity, it would be fair to say that, nowadays, it is, in fact, incorrect to speak of *the* New Mass in the singular, so varied has its form become. Present eucharistic activities within the Catholic Church would be described much better if the plural was substituted for the singular. "New Eucharistic Celebrations" are what we ought to speak of. The New Mass is multiform and, for that reason alone, increasingly disruptive.

What, then, happens to belief under the circumstances just described and which are in no way news to anyone? Where are we? Few seem to know these days and fewer still seem to care. Progressive clerics, high and low, bolt from the answer like so many frightened rabbits. Under the circumstances, it is no coincidence that a new and bogus theological pluralism has come in to parallel its liturgical counterpart. As unity of worship is shattered, unity of belief follows suit.

Michael Davies' exposure—a better word here than "exposition"—is brilliant and brave; brilliant in its perceptiveness, brave in its willingness to take on the Progressive Liturgical Establishment, commissars and all, in defence of the Old Mass and the Old Faith, of which the Old Mass was so sublime an expression. His courage is supported by an ability to marshal facts in support of his case, which I would rate as unequalled. I have found nothing like it anywhere. You name it and Davies will produce it, chapter

and verse, like a rabbit out of a hat, and he is never wrong. It is for this reason, presumably, that Progressives—they include a Cardinal abroad—will not respond to the challenges he throws at them—in no way arrogantly, but with confidence and a quiet puckish humour; the kind of half-smile on his face that makes them uneasy. It is entirely understandable that this should be so. No one, after all, wants to go into an argument from which he will emerge with the loss, not only of his case, but of his clothes as well. Tin-pot emperors, in particular, are averse from displaying their nudity in public; but this is what they will be forced to do when Davies has finished with them. The Progressive Establishment is full of these people. If they strip off at all, it is in the privacy of their chambers and nowhere else. The last thing they want is the public realization of what they already know in their hearts—that they have no case. No one knows this better than Davies himself. This is why they refuse public debate with him. This is why they will not read his book. They know it will blow them, along with their case (if they ever had one), sky-high when they do. When you link your life to a lie, the truth is hard to bear. That is why the Progressives run from it. Guilty men are embarrassed when they know they are seen through. And Davies sees right through them in this book. They emerge from his pages, perfect images of their own, slightly ridiculous, selves.

For this reason, no doubt, members of the Progressive Establishment, liturgical and otherwise, have resorted to the kind of duplicity that has led them, again and again, to employ half-truths, ambiguities, more than half-truths and every kind of double-speak in their disruptive progress, which appears to have for its ultimate objective the dismantling not only of the Mass, but of the Church itself. To read Michael Davies' pages is to see laid bare the deceitfulness, to say nothing of the cruelty that has accompanied so much of the so-called liturgical reform. The mark of these abuses is laid bare in Davies' pages and, everywhere, Davies supports his indictment of the whole, unlovely progressive, liturgical "progress" with irrefutable fact. With courage, confidence and quiet humour he lays bare the game of those who may not, indeed, be conspirators in the

true meaning of the word, but who most certainly constitute a *conspiratio*, a breathing together of like-minded revolutionaries, who remain still entrenched in positions of power within the Church and who are still phrenetically concerned with the unlovely business of deforming into total destruction what remains of what was once the glory of Christendom; the ancient and splendid liturgy of the Catholic Church.

I am conscious at the end of this review of having said so little. But what can I say of a work of 673 close-packed and detailed pages written in defence not only of the Old Mass, but of the Old Faith, which is our Faith, and of which the Old Mass was so perfect an expression? I place on record my thanks to the Author not only for his present work, which is so remarkable, but for the two, in the Trilogy, that preceded it. The three are indispensable for an understanding of the troubles of our times. Together, they constitute the finest and most telling commentary that has yet been written on the deformation inflicted on the Catholic Church during the past decade and a half. I commend this third volume of Michael Davies' Trilogy most warmly and very particularly to readers of *Christian Order*. The least return we can make to the Author of this last magnificent work is not only to buy it, but to read it as well and pass it on to others to read. This way the truth will come out—as it becomes clear in the minds of individual readers. Already it is beginning to emerge. It will grow in strength as we grow strong in our appreciation of it and gather in its support. To read this book is to grow in the truth and to take to ourselves the strength that comes with its possession. The end of that road, under God, is the triumph of the truth. For this we must not only pray but do: "*Magna est veritas et prevalebit*".

Paul Crane, S.J.

PS:—With reference to the first paragraph of this review-article, readers may be both interested and amused to know it was written well before the storm that broke at the end of March with the publication of Chapman Pincher's, *Their Trade is Treachery*.

—The Editor.

THE WAY

Created from no-thing
Into nature
We are held
In contradiction.
Re-created into supernature
And the contradiction
Is compounded

And so we journey on
Between good and evil,
Spirit and Flesh,
Faith and doubt,
Lifted by angels,
Tripped by devils,
Destined for heaven,
In peril of hell.

Every sign
Points straight
To the cross road.

—Frank Rickards

THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH —

regarding this subject, have you read Michael Davies on:

THE TRIDENTINE MASS

Reduced from 40p plus p&p to 40p/\$1.00 post free.

THE NEW MASS

Reduced from 40p plus p&p to 40p/\$1.00 post free.

THE ROMAN RITE DESTROYED

Reduced from 50p plus p&p to 45p/\$1.00 post free.

We will supply a complete set of the above for

£1.00 / \$2.50 post free

THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH

A penetrating study on the new rite of Ordination, and the attempt to circumvent *Apostolicae Curae*. (Paper 232 pp 8 illus.)

Special offer to *Christian Order* readers: £3.00/\$7.00 post free.

APOLOGIA PRO MARCEL LEFEBVRE

No one can talk knowledgeably about the Archbishop's case without first mastering the complete documentation, for and against presented in this book.

Paper 460 pages. 25 illus. £4.00 plus 75p p&p.

Available, for cash with order, subject to availability, from:

AUGUSTINE PUBLISHING CO.

Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL, U.K.

Free list of traditional Catholic titles sent on request.